

Chapter 2

Description of Alternatives

Introduction

This chapter identifies current management within the Lake Havasu Field Office (LHFO) planning area and the proposed alternatives to address decisions needed for the various combinations of public land uses and resource management practices identified during the scoping process. Through the planning process (see Appendix C), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) became aware of a public desire to see the Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) organized foremost by resource, rather than by alternative or location, so that readers could more easily compare how proposed management under each of the alternatives would affect the resources under LHFO's administration.

- The alternatives section presents five alternatives, organized by resource, that were developed as possible solutions to the issues discussed in Chapter 1. Each alternative presents a different blend and balance of resource allocations and emphasis. All alternatives comply with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) requirement that the BLM managed public lands be managed by the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.
- Typical Management Actions and Standard Operating Procedures is a summary of the objectives, basic management policy, and program direction that is applicable regardless of which alternative is selected. Any of the alternatives, when coupled with the continuing management guidance, could be implemented as the selected Resource Management Plan (RMP).
- Implementation and monitoring section describes plans for further study of resource issues with environmental sensitivity where multiple use allocations from the RMP, or neighboring activities, may impact desired resource yields. Monitoring would be used to adjust uses to achieve Desired Future Conditions.
- Included is a table of the comparison of impacts by alternatives and by resource.

Throughout this chapter, information is displayed at a broad, overview level and then moves to the specific. The planning document is presented first by resource, the presence or abundance of which may vary from location to location within the planning area. Three different types of land use plan decisions are presented for each resource under all alternatives: Desired Future Conditions, Land Use Allocations, and Management

Actions. In some instances, additional, more specific Administrative Actions are also presented.

Desired future conditions represent land or resource conditions that are expected to result if planning goals and objectives are fully achieved. Land Use Allocations defined as allowed, restricted, and prohibited uses or activities within a specific geographic area. Management actions are actions that BLM would implement under a given alternative to achieve the Desired Future Conditions for a particular resource.

Although BLM's intent and commitment to accomplish Administrative Actions are generally addressed in RMP/EIS-level documents, such activities are neither land-use-plan-level decisions nor implementation-level management-action decisions. Administrative actions are day-to-day activities conducted by BLM, often required by FLPMA that do not require a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis or a decision by a responsible official to be accomplished. Examples of Administrative Actions include mapping, surveying, inventorying, monitoring, collecting needed information such as research and studies, and completing project-specific or implementation-level plans.

Two additional types of land use plan decisions (Land Use Tenure and Special Area Designations) are presented in separate sections and concern all resources. Land tenure decisions (i.e., lands identified for retention, proposed disposal, or acquisition) consolidate all the resources and are presented in the "Lands and Realty" resource discussion. Special area designation decisions, which are nationally recognized land use designations for protection of one or more sensitive resources (such as Area of Environmental Concern [ACEC] or Back Country Byway), are consolidated for all resources and presented as a separate resource discussion. Like Land Use Allocations and Management Actions, Land Tenure and Special Area Designation decisions must support the goals outlined in the Desired Future Conditions.

Overview of the Alternatives

This section provides brief, general descriptions of the No-Action (current management) Alternative and four action alternatives. Detailed management prescriptions are presented under the applicable resource headings.

Each alternative is composed of a set of components (decisions) that can be identified as a general theme. Each theme represents a distinct concept for management using a variety of land use planning decision types (including Desired Future Conditions, Special Area Designations, Land Use Allocations and Management Actions). These decisions provide management direction at a broad scale and guide future actions to govern management of BLM public lands.

Alternative 1 (No-Action Alternative)

Alternative 1 describes the current management of BLM lands in the LHFO planning area. The current management identifies the management decisions contained within

existing management plans that would continue to occur if no new decisions are made to alter them. Prior to the start of the LHFO RMP planning process, BLM conducted a statewide review of all the existing land use plan decisions. Those management plan decisions that were determined to be valid are also listed in Appendix D of both this EIS and in the *Lake Havasu Field Office Resource Management Plan Scoping Report* (Bureau of Land Management 2002). Readers who may want to track acreages between the four existing lands use plans and the acreages listed in Alternative 1 should note that Alternative 1 reflects only those portions of existing plans applicable to the LHFO planning area.

Supplemental Rules are another category of decisions that affect the way BLM manages the Lake Havasu Shoreline Program, the Parker Strip Recreation Area, and Craggy Wash. The Supplemental Rules are part of the implementation of ongoing management. These rules are revised periodically to reduce conflicts among a highly diverse group of resource users. Supplementary Rules are listed in the back of Appendix B

Because their decisions affect the way BLM manages public land today, Alternative 1 also includes decisions from the *Gibraltar Mountain Interdisciplinary Management Plan and Environmental Assessment* (Bureau of Land Management 2001), the *Parker Strip Recreation Area Management Plan* (Bureau of Land Management 1993), and any notices that have been published in the Federal Register.

To show those decisions that are valid under the current four land use plans, decisions for Alternative 1 are displayed two ways: 1) Those existing land use plan decisions that are applicable only to Alternative 1 (and *not* being carried forward into any of the alternatives) will indicate that the decisions are applicable only to those lands identified under an existing RMP. 2) Those existing land use plan decisions that are applicable (and will be carried forward) to all alternatives will indicate that these decisions are applicable to the entire planning area.

Alternative 1 serves as a baseline and an opportunity to compare the current management with the various strategies that are proposed for future management (Alternatives 2, 3, and 4). A component of the RMP planning process is a critical assessment of potential impacts to the resources that may be expected as a result of a continuation of current management or implementation of new management practices. The results of those assessments are presented as Chapter 4, "Environmental Consequences."

Alternative 2

Alternative 2 emphasizes resource protection through a focus on natural processes and other discrete methods for resource management, minimal human use and influence, and enhanced protection of remoteness and primitive recreation. For example, more areas are restricted from mineral development, recreation management focuses on more primitive and semi-primitive recreation activities within Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs), and there is designation of more public lands as ACECs.

Alternative 3

Alternative 3 places an emphasis on maximum resource use and a more flexible, permissive resource management approach. For example, there are very few restrictions on mineral development, there is a higher level of motorized recreation and the fewest number of ACECs would be designated.

Alternative 4

Alternative 4 seeks to preserve the unique values of lands within the LHFO planning area while accommodating reasonable levels of use. The “middle-of-the-road” approach to resource management proposed in Alternative 4 would provide a moderate amount of mineral development, recreation would have a mix of motorized and primitive recreation opportunities and a median number of ACECs would be designated.

Preferred Alternative, Alternative 5

Alternative 5 is BLM’s Preferred Alternative (PA). In the most comprehensive manner, the PA is designed to respond to each of the issues and management concerns recognized during the planning process. BLM has determined that the Management Actions presented under Alternative 5 would provide an optimal balance between authorized resource use and the protection and long-term sustainability of sensitive resources within the planning area. As with Alternatives 1 through 4, Alternative 5 is the summation of its Desired Future Conditions, Land Use Allocations and Management Actions, as well as the information in the separate discussion in Management Common to All Alternatives.

Management Units

Planning areas are often divided into Management Units (MUs). While the MUs are not Land Use Allocations, smaller units can make planning easier during the land use planning process. Among BLM planning areas in Arizona, LHFO is unique in that it comprises two aquatic and riparian/desert transition zones in addition to a rugged primary desert environment. In an effort to best represent the diversity and importance of these ecosystems, three MUs—the Colorado River MU, the Bill Williams MU, and the Desert MU—were developed. The boundaries of these MUs are shown on Map 2-1. Table 2-1 presents more detailed descriptions of the boundaries, salient characteristics, and overall management goals of each MU.

Table 2-1. Management Units in the LHFO Planning Area

	Colorado River MU	Bill Williams MU	Desert MU
General Location	The Colorado River MU extends along the river from Davis Dam in the north to Headgate Dam in the south, encompassing the entire northern arm of the LHFO planning area. South of Interstate 40 (I-40), the eastern boundary is defined by State Route (SR) 95. This MU includes all of the lands in California managed by the LHFO.	The Bill Williams MU follows the Bill Williams River corridor from the eastern LHFO boundary in the vicinity of Alamo Lake to the confluence of the Bill Williams and Colorado Rivers. The MU boundaries roughly correspond to northern and southern boundaries of the Rawhide and Swansea Wilderness Areas (WAs).	The Desert MU comprises all lands within the LHFO planning area that are not within the Colorado River or Bill Williams MUs.
History	Significant prehistoric sites within this MU include trails, intaglios, petroglyph sites, and campsites. The Yuman people lived along the river prior to European contact, farming in the river bottomlands. At contact, the Mojave and Chemehuevi peoples occupied the areas along the Colorado River within this MU. Early European explorers included Juan de Oñate, who traveled down the Colorado River from the confluence with the Bill Williams River in 1604; Father Francisco Garcés, who traveled along the river in 1776; and the Whipple and Beale surveys in the 1850s. Early European settlers included ranchers and miners. During this period, the river meandered throughout the region with spring and summer floods. Portions of the region were extensively mined in the late 1800s and early 1900s.	Significant prehistoric and historic sites in the Bill Williams MU include petroglyphs, trails, rock shelters, historic period cemeteries, and 19th century mining features. The Yavapai people occupied this area at the time of first contact. Juan de Oñate traveled down the Bill Williams in 1604, Father Garcés in the 1770s, and Whipple in 1853-54. Early settlers included ranchers and miners. Swansea, a copper mining town, was established in 1908.	Significant prehistoric sites in this unit include intaglios, pictograph and petroglyph sites, trails, villages/campsites and procurement sites. Various Native Americans made the deserts home. Early history includes mining and ranching activities. Portions of the Desert MU south of the Bill Williams River, including Camp Bouse, served as military training areas during World War II.
Ecosystems	The Lower Colorado River within the LHFO boundary is regulated by three dams: Davis, Parker, and Headgate. The MU is located within the Lower Colorado River Valley Subdivision of the Sonoran Desertscrub Biome. Both sides of the river	The Bill Williams River constitutes a unique riparian area populated by cottonwoods, willows, large acacia, and mesquite intermixing with the bulrushes and cattails. Invasive Tamarisk species have infiltrated and in many areas have	The Bill Williams River is the dividing feature for plant species. North of the Bill Williams River, the Desert MU is a unique intermixing of the Mojave and Sonoran Deserts. South of the Bill Williams River the

Table 2-1. Management Units in the LHFO Planning Area

	Colorado River MU	Bill Williams MU	Desert MU
	contain a mixture of Mojave and Sonoran desert species. Small inlets and backwaters occur along the river. These riparian and marsh areas are necessary to sustain fish and neotropical migratory species.	out-competed the native riparian species. The riparian and marsh areas are utilized by neotropical migratory species, including the endangered Southwestern willow flycatcher, Yuma clapper rail, and yellow-billed cuckoo. Mammal species including desert bighorn sheep and mule deer utilize the area, as do numerous reptiles and amphibians. The riparian area transitions into the desert floor and acts as the dividing point for the Mojave/Sonoran Transition Desertscrub Biome (a mixed community to the north) and the Sonoran Desertscrub Biome to the south.	area is dry Sonoran Desert, but is still considered part of the Lower Colorado River Subdivision of the Sonoran Desertscrub Biome. Mountain ranges both to the north and south of the Bill Williams River are classified in the Arizona Upland Subdivision of the Sonoran Desertscrub Biome.
Socioeconomics	The four largest incorporated towns within the planning area (Bullhead City, Lake Havasu City, Needles, and Parker) are within this MU. These towns and the smaller communities along SR 95 north of I-40 create a growing urban interface with BLM lands in this unit. Tourism and recreational development provided by BLM, BLM concessionaires, private enterprises, and state/county/tribal-run entities are a major economic component within this MU. Most of the recreational use is focused on the Colorado River and Lake Havasu.	An economic component within this MU is farming. Private lands in the area are highly modified and include Lincoln and Planet Ranches. The recreational activities include primitive and wilderness camping and exploring backcountry trails, both on foot and in 4-wheel-drive vehicles. Recreational visitation occurs at the Swansea Townsite. In addition, one developed recreation area is located at Alamo Lake, which is operated by Arizona State Parks.	Farming, ranching, and tourism comprise much of the rural economic activity within this MU. A major economic component is winter visitors. Visitors tend to stay in RV parks in small communities such as Brenda, Bouse, Hope, and Salome, or camp on public lands as long as 14 days. A popular recreational pastime is using off-highway vehicles (OHVs) to explore the unit's vast open spaces and resources via the backcountry trails.
Goals	Primary management goals are to enhance recreational opportunities while preserving important resources, including the riparian ecosystem and visual elements of the surrounding landscape.	Primary management goals are to protect important resources and the scenic features of this river while providing for dispersed, low-impact recreational opportunities.	Primary management goal is to protect important resources within this MU, including the natural landscapes that characterize the area.
Management of	Already high recreational usage along the Colorado River is increasing annually.	Natural landscapes dominate the Bill Williams area. A high priority in the unit	The Desert MU is characterized by vast natural landscapes. Most

Table 2-1. Management Units in the LHFO Planning Area

	Colorado River MU	Bill Williams MU	Desert MU
Uses	<p>Management focus is on providing and maintaining both basic and specialized facilities for recreation.</p> <p>A high priority in the unit is the proper functioning of riparian areas. The upland areas contain desert landscapes, where wildlife species diversification is high.</p> <p>High levels of resource and visitor use may be expected for the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>is the proper functioning of riparian areas. The river traverses rolling hills creating spectacular canyons, and is currently suitable for designation to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System due to its outstanding scenic, cultural, and wildlife values.</p> <p>Generally low levels of visitor use are typical throughout the area, except at Alamo Lake and the Swansea Townsite.</p>	<p>activities rely on motorized or mechanized means of travel. Moderate levels of resource use may be expected, especially at popular destinations. The majority of grazing occurs within this unit.</p>
Justification of MU Boundary	The Colorado River MU represents a critical biotic and economic asset to the entire region of the Southwest. Lands within this MU are distinguished from the remainder of the LHFO planning area by this area's role as a recreational destination.	The Bill Williams MU includes a riparian zone, two WAs (Rawhide Mountains and Swansea Wilderness), and Alamo Lake.	The Desert MU includes all the remaining areas within the LHFO.

This page left intentionally blank.

Land Health Standards

Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (Standards and Guidelines) were developed, pursuant to 43 CFR 4180, through a collaborative process involving BLM staff and the Arizona Resource Advisory Council and were approved by the Secretary of Interior in April 1997. The Standards and Guidelines have been developed to identify the characteristics of healthy ecosystems on public lands and the Management Actions that promote them. When approved, the Standards and Guidelines became Arizona BLM policy, guiding the planning for and management of BLM administered lands. Arizona Standards and Guidelines, therefore, have been incorporated into this RMP. The following Arizona BLM Standards for Rangeland Health describe the conditions necessary to encourage proper functioning of ecological processes and are adopted as Land Health Standards that are applicable to Arizona BLM program-wide. The Guidelines for Grazing Administration are a series of management practices used to ensure that grazing activities meet the Standards. These Guidelines are incorporated into the RMP in the Rangeland Management/Grazing, Management Actions section.

Standard 1: Upland Sites

Upland soils exhibit infiltration, permeability, and erosion rates that are appropriate to soil type, climate, and landform (ecological site).

Criteria for Meeting Standard 1:

Soil conditions support proper functioning of hydrologic, energy, and nutrient cycles. Many factors interact to maintain stable soils and healthy soil conditions, including appropriate amounts of vegetative cover, litter, and soil porosity and organic matter. Under proper functioning conditions, rates of soil loss and infiltration are consistent with the potential of the site.

Ground cover in the form of plants, litter, or rock is present in pattern, kind, and amount sufficient to prevent accelerated erosion for the ecological site; or ground cover is increasing as determined by monitoring over an established period of time.

Signs of accelerated erosion are minimal or diminishing for the ecological site as determined by monitoring over an established period of time.

As indicated by such factors as:

Ground cover:

- litter
- live vegetation, amount and type (e.g., grass, shrubs, trees, etc.)

- rock.

Signs of erosion:

- flow pattern
- gullies
- rills
- plant pedestaling.

Exceptions and exemptions (where applicable):

- none.

Standard 2: Riparian-Wetland Sites

Riparian-wetland areas are in properly functioning condition.

Criteria for Meeting Standard 2:

Stream channel morphology and functions are appropriate for proper functioning condition for existing climate, landform, and channel reach characteristics. Riparian-wetland areas are functioning properly when adequate vegetation, landform, or large woody debris is present to dissipate stream energy associated with high water flows.

Riparian-wetland functioning condition assessments are based on examination of hydrologic, vegetative, soil, and erosion-deposition factors. BLM has developed a standard checklist to address these factors and make functional assessments. Riparian-wetland areas are functioning properly as indicated by the results of the application of the appropriate checklist.

The checklist for riparian areas is in Technical Reference 1737-9 "Process for Assessing Proper Functioning Condition." The checklist for wetlands is in Technical Reference 1737-11 "Process for Assessing Proper Functioning Condition for Lentic Riparian-Wetland Areas."

As indicated by such factors as:

- Gradient
- Width/depth ratio
- Channel roughness and sinuosity of stream channel
- Bank stabilization
- Reduced erosion
- Captured sediment
- Groundwater recharge

- Dissipation of energy by vegetation.

Exceptions and exemptions (where applicable):

- Dirt tanks, wells, and other water facilities constructed or placed at a location for the purpose of providing water for livestock and/or wildlife and which have not been determined through local planning efforts to provide for riparian or wetland habitat are exempt.
- Water impoundments permitted for construction, mining, or other similar activities are exempt.

Standard 3: Desired Resource Conditions

Productive and diverse upland and riparian-wetland plant communities of native species exist and are maintained.

Criteria for Meeting Standard 3:

Upland and riparian-wetland plant communities meet desired plant community objectives. Plant community objectives are determined with consideration for all multiple uses. Objectives also address native species, and the requirements of the Taylor Grazing Act, Federal Land Policy and Management Act, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, and appropriate laws, regulations, and policies.

Desired plant community objectives will be developed to assure that soil conditions and ecosystem function described in Standards 1 and 2 are met. They detail a site-specific plant community that, when obtained, will assure rangeland health, State water quality standards, and habitat for endangered, threatened, and sensitive species. Thus, desired plant community objectives will be used as an indicator of ecosystem function and rangeland health.

As indicated by such factors as:

- Composition
- Structure
- Distribution.

Exceptions and exemptions (where applicable):

- Ecological sites or stream reaches on which a change in existing vegetation is physically, biologically, or economically impractical are exempt.

Cultural Resource Management

The general desired future condition of cultural resource management is to preserve and protect significant cultural resources for future generations. Cultural resources are sites, buildings, objects, features, and artifacts that indicate past lifeways and represent the nation's collective past. These include, but are not limited to, prehistoric and historic period archeological sites that are managed for the benefit of all Americans.

Goals and objectives have been developed for this plan in accordance with BLM's cultural resource planning guidance documents; these may be found in the Cultural Resources appendix (Appendix E). Desired future conditions, Land Use Allocations, and Management Actions apply to the entire planning area.

BLM evaluates cultural resources according to their current and potential uses. Cultural resources can be allocated to one or more of the categories listed in Table 2-2 below.

Table 2-2. Categories for Cultural Resource Allocation

Land Use Allocation ¹	Desired Future Condition	Management Actions
a. Scientific Use	Preserved until research potential is realized	Permit appropriate research, including data recovery
b. Conservation for Future Use	Preserved until conditions for use are met	Propose protective measures or designations
c. Traditional Use	Long-term preservation	Consult with tribes; determine limitations ²
d. Public Use	Long-term preservation, on-site interpretation	Determine limitations, permitted uses ²
e. Experimental Use	Protected until used	Determine nature of experiment
f. Discharged from Management	No use after recordation; not preserved	Remove protective measures

Notes:

¹ These use categories are defined in the glossary. The majority of the cultural properties in a given geographic area would fall into categories "a" and "f." The less common properties in categories "b" through "e" are likely to be associated with particular settings that can be delineated geographically in the planning process. Properties in categories "b" through "d" would require the most attention to balance their proactive uses with other land and resource uses.

² Safeguards against incompatible land and resource uses may be imposed through withdrawals, stipulations on leases and permits, design requirements, and similar measures that are developed and recommended by an appropriately staffed interdisciplinary team.

Table 2-3, Table 2-4, and Table 2-5 show the desired future conditions, land use allocations, and management actions for Alternative 1 (the no-action alternative) and proposed Alternatives 2, 3, 4 and 5 (Preferred). Decisions that appear in contiguous cells in the table represent management that is common to the alternatives indicated.

Table 2-3. Cultural Resource Management–Desired Future Conditions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1983 Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan (LGNMFP) and will be applicable to the entire planning area.</i></p> <p>Conserve a representative sample of site types in the planning area for future use.</p> <p>Identify and evaluate areas and properties with socio-cultural values to reduce potential impacts of other land uses on these resources.</p>	<p>Preserve and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.</p> <p>BLM would identify sacred sites in consultation with Indian tribes, accommodate tribal access to sacred sites, and prevent physical damage or intrusions that might impede their use by religious practitioners. The locations of sacred sites and other places of traditional or religious importance to Indian tribes would be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law.</p>			

Table 2-4. Cultural Resource Management–Land Use Allocation

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1987 Yuma District Resource Management Plan (YRMP) and will be applicable to the entire planning area.</i></p> <p>Cultural resources on 15 sites and areas totaling approximately 800 acres will be managed under the “conservation for future use” category, i.e., preserved in place.</p> <p>Public Use – one site.</p> <p>Traditional Use – None identified in the previous plans.</p>	<p>Conservation for Future Use—Some sites currently managed under Conservation for Future Use would be allocated to the Traditional Use category.</p> <p>Additional sites may be shifted to Traditional Use category if Indian tribes identify them in the future.</p> <p>Traditional Use – Sites allocated to Traditional Use would be limited to those identified by Indian tribes as important for maintaining their cultural identity, heritage, or well-being.</p> <p>Significant sites (or features) would be stabilized, fenced, or otherwise managed to protect the values ascribed to these sites by Indian tribes.</p> <p>Public Use – Only Swansea is currently allocated to Public Use. Sites allocated to Public Use would be limited to those considered suitable as an interpretive exhibit-in-place, a subject of supervised participation in scientific or historical study, or related educational and recreational uses by members of the general public</p> <p>Scientific Use – Sites allocated to Scientific Use are those with the potential to yield important information where current archaeological and historical investigative techniques can adequately extract that information. These sites would be preserved in place until their scientific values are recovered.</p> <p>Experimental Use – Sites allocated to Experimental Use would generally be drawn from properties that are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) but may include eligible properties if the experimental uses would not adversely affect the characteristics that make them eligible.</p> <p>Discharged from Management – Only sites determined ineligible for inclusion on the NRHP would be placed in the Discharged from Management category.</p>			
Fourteen sites are allocated to Conservation for Future Use, and one site is allocated to Public Use (60 FR 53194-53195). No sites are designated for Traditional Use.	BLM would allocate 35 sites to Conservation for Future Use, seven sites to Traditional Use, and six sites to Public Use.	BLM would allocate 25 sites to Conservation for Future Use, five sites to Traditional Use, and eleven sites to Public Use.	BLM would allocate 28 sites to Conservation for Future Use, seven sites to Traditional Use, and eight sites to Public Use.	

Table 2-4. Cultural Resource Management–Land Use Allocation

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Public Use - Swansea is managed as a Public Use site. A 1995 Federal Register Notice, 60 FR 53194-53195, details specific allocations and management prescriptions for Swansea, effectively changing Swansea from Conservation for Future Use to Public Use.				
Not addressed in previous plans	Manage Schwanbeck's Store as a Public Use site and maintain existing interpretive panels.			
In the previous management plans, five intaglios, two petroglyph sites, six habitation site complexes (more than one site in the same geographical area), and one linear historic site were allocated to Conservation for Future Use. Sites are listed in the cultural resource appendix (Appendix E).	Conservation for Future Use – Five intaglios, 12 petroglyph/pictograph sites, 16 habitation/site complex areas, and two historic mining areas would be allocated to the Conservation for Future Use category and preserved in place. Sites are listed in the cultural resource appendix (Appendix E).	Conservation for Future Use – Three intaglio/ intaglio complexes, eight petroglyph/pictograph sites, and 14 habitation/site complex areas would be allocated to the Conservation for Future Use category and preserved in place. Sites are listed in the cultural resource appendix (Appendix E).	Allocate the following sites to Conservation for Future Use – Three intaglios/intaglio complexes, 10 petroglyph/pictograph sites, 13 habitation/site complex areas, and two historic mining areas would be allocated to the Conservation for Future Use category and preserved in place. Sites are listed in the cultural resource appendix (Appendix E).	
Traditional Use – None identified.	Traditional Use – Five intaglios, one petroglyph site, and one site complex (trail, intaglio and rock art) would be allocated to the Traditional Use category. Sites are listed in the cultural resource appendix (Appendix E).	Traditional Use – Five intaglios would be allocated to the Traditional Use category. Sites are listed in the cultural resource appendix (Appendix E).	Allocate the following sites to Traditional Use – Five intaglios, one petroglyph site, and one site complex (trail, intaglio and rock art) would be allocated to the Traditional Use category. Sites are listed in the cultural resource appendix (Appendix E).	
Swansea is managed as a Public Use site.	Public Use – Manage Atlantic & Pacific	Public Use – Manage A&P Railroad, Camp	Public Use – Manage A&P Railroad,	Allocate the following sites to Public Use –

Table 2-4. Cultural Resource Management–Land Use Allocation

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
	Railroad (A&P) Railroad, Mohave & Milltown Railroad, Camp Bouse, Schwanbeck's, Swansea, and Hardy Toll Road for public visitation and preserve them for future generations. No facilities would be built except signs.	<p>Bouse, Swansea, McGuffie Cabin, and Hargus Cabin for public visitation. Develop educational and recreational facilities (e.g., picnic tables with ramadas if appropriate), educational signs, brochures and/or web page.</p> <p>Manage Mohave & Milltown Railroad, Schwanbeck's Store, and Hardy Toll Road for public visitation and preserve them for future generations. No facilities would be built except signs.</p> <p>Manage two historic mine complexes and Culling's Well for public visitation and preserve them for future generations. No facilities would be built except signs.</p>	<p>Culling's Well and Hardy Toll Road for public visitation and preserve them for future generations. No facilities would be installed except signs.</p> <p>Manage McGuffie Cabin, Camp Bouse, Swansea, Schwanbeck's, and Hargus Cabin for public visitation. Develop educational signs, brochures, and/or web page for public use and education, along with some developed recreation amenities.</p>	Manage A&P Railroad, Culling's Well and Hardy Toll Road, McGuffie Cabin, Camp Bouse, Swansea, Schwanbeck's and Hargus Cabin for public visitation and preserve them for future generations.
No specific guidelines exist in current management plans to protect significant places of traditional cultural or religious importance other than compliance with laws and Executive Orders (e.g., National	Under Special Area Designations, Crossman Peak would be managed as a Natural Scenic Area (Alternative 1) or an ACEC under all other alternatives, in part due to Native American values associated with Crossman Peak.			

Table 2-4. Cultural Resource Management–Land Use Allocation

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Executive Order 13007). Crossman Peak would be managed as a Natural Scenic Area, in part due to Native American values associated with Crossman Peak.				
Not addressed in previous plans.	Allocate the following areas as Special Cultural Resource Management Areas: Bullhead Bajada, 4,387 acres (Conservation for Future Use and Traditional Use); Harcuvar Mountain East, 17,048 acres (Conservation for Future Use); Harcuvar Mountain West, 10,249 acres (Conservation for Future Use and Public Use); Topock-Needles, 1,127 acres. (Conservation for Future Use and Traditional Use); Black Peak, 768 acres (Traditional Use); Swansea, 6,839 acres (Conservation for Future Use and Public Use). See Map 2-2			

Table 2-5. Cultural Resource Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1987 YRMP and will be applicable to the entire planning area.</i></p> <p>Off-highway vehicle use on the 15 cultural resource sites and areas is restricted to existing roads and trails. .</p> <p>Allowable uses on the 15 cultural resource sites and areas include activities that are compatible with the objective of preserving these resources in place for future use.</p> <p>Improvements on the 15 cultural resource sites and areas would be restricted to those that are compatible with the cultural resources or those required for mining.</p> <p>Approximately 35 acres (5%) of the 15 cultural resource sites and areas are under the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) withdrawal and are therefore segregated from mineral entry and development. Mining activity on the remaining sites and areas will be managed to avoid disruption or, where this is not possible, minimize damage to cultural values using regulatory standards contained in 43 CFR 3800.</p> <p>Surface occupancy for oil and gas leases, sand and gravel permits, and utility rights-of-way will not be authorized on the 15 cultural resource sites and areas.</p>	<p>The following apply to sites managed for Conservation for Future Use, Traditional Use, and Public Use:</p> <p>Motorized use on cultural resource sites and site complexes managed for Conservation for Future Use, Traditional Use, and Public Use would be restricted to designated open roads and trails.</p> <p>Allowable uses on the cultural resource sites and site complexes managed for Conservation for Future Use, Traditional Use, and Public Use include activities that are compatible with the objective of preserving these resources for future use.</p> <p>Improvements on cultural resource sites and site complexes managed for Conservation for Future Use, Traditional Use, and Public Use would be restricted to those that are compatible with the cultural resources or those required for mining. Some of the cultural resource sites and areas are under BOR withdrawal and are therefore segregated from mineral entry and development. Mining activity on the remaining sites and areas would be managed to avoid disruption or, where avoidance is not possible, to minimize damage to cultural values using regulatory standards contained in 43 CFR 3800.</p> <p>Surface occupancy for oil and gas leases, mineral material disposals, and rights-of-way (ROWs) would not be authorized on the cultural resource sites and site complexes managed for Conservation for Future Use, Traditional Use, and Public Use.</p> <p>Management for sites allocated to Public Use may include but is not limited to signs, educational displays, picnic tables, ramadas, parking areas, and protective fencing.</p>			

Table 2-5. Cultural Resource Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Existing communications sites would be removed from Black Peak.				All communication facilities on Black Peak would be phased out and relocated at a suitable site through negotiation with the Colorado River Indian Tribes and the site lessees.
Management prescriptions for Special Cultural Resource Management Areas (SCRMA) would reflect and support the primary values for which the areas are allocated. Management prescriptions in SCRMA allocated primarily to conserve sites for the future would protect selected sites within the SCRMA that are scarce, that are of singular importance, and that should not be subjected to invasive studies or other uses that would threaten their present condition. Management prescriptions for SCRMA allocated primarily for Traditional Use would seek to accommodate the traditional cultural practices of Indian tribes or other cultural groups that ascribe religious or other heritage values to specific places within the SCRMA. Management prescriptions for SCRMA allocated primarily for public use would focus on developing and interpreting selected sites for public visitation, including heritage tourism.				
<i>The following decision is derived from the 1995 Kingman Resource Area Resource Management Plan (KRMP) and will be applicable to the entire planning area.</i>	Acquire properties adjacent to public lands that contain significant cultural resources including, but not limited to, those properties eligible for inclusion on NRHP. Priority acquisitions would be for lands that contain portions of eligible sites also located on public lands.			
BLM would acquire approximately 2,340 acres of non-federal minerals and close these areas to mineral entry to protect critical resources. The non-federal minerals are located within T. 19 N., R. 21 W., sections 5, 7, 9, and 33.				
Not specifically addressed in previous plans, but based on policy, plant, seed, and fruit collection by Native Americans is authorized under collection permits.	BLM would work with Native Americans to select harvesting areas and allow noncommercial (personal or tribal use) collection of medicinal	Seed and plant collection would be authorized for limited amounts on request under an annual collection permit. Collection of T&E, BLM-listed, or state-listed special status species would not be authorized.	BLM would work and coordinate with Native Americans to select harvesting areas and allow noncommercial (personal or tribal use) collection of medicinal	

Table 2-5. Cultural Resource Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
	or ceremonial herbs and appropriate vegetation without specific annual authorization. Collection of federally listed threatened and endangered (T&E) species would not be authorized.			or ceremonial herbs and necessary vegetation with specific annual authorization as appropriate Collection of federally listed T&E species would not be authorized (see Biological Resources page 2-129).
Not addressed in previous plans	BLM would work and coordinate with Native Americans to select harvesting areas and allow noncommercial (personal use) collection of minerals (e.g., quartz, clay) for traditional or ceremonial use without specific authorization or sale as appropriate.			
Not addressed in previous plans	BLM would review requests for vehicular access to sacred areas not normally open to vehicles and consider authorizing such use on a case-by-case basis if Indian tribes identify such areas.			

Management Common to All Alternatives

- Design and maintain facilities in a manner that preserves the visual integrity of cultural resource settings and cultural landscapes, in accordance with Visual Resource Management (VRM) objectives established in this RMP.
- Avoid the disturbance or removal of Native American human remains and associated items to the extent possible. Avoid directing site visitors toward areas where these items could be observed or disturbed.
- Implement physical and administrative protection measures to stop, limit, or repair damage and vandalism to sites. On a site-specific basis, these measures may include route closures, restrictions on grazing or other uses, construction of fences or other types of barriers, construction of erosion control measures, backfilling or stabilization of structures, or placement of signs.
- Maintain the placement and condition of fiberglass post signs with the message of the Arizona Site Steward Program on sites that are vulnerable to vandalism. Install protective signs in a manner that avoids drawing attention to sites.

- Include stipulations in special recreation permits to ensure that commercial tour operations will not damage cultural resources. Require tour operators to report any new vandalism or damage to sites.

Administrative Action

Ensure that all undertakings and authorizations for land and resource use are reviewed and conducted in compliance with Section 106 of NHPA, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and other applicable laws.

- Complete Class II (sample) and Class III (intensive) field inventories to identify cultural resources and evaluate the condition of sites, in accordance with Section 110 of NHPA. Seek to inventory 100 - 400 acres per year for cultural values. Use the information obtained through these archaeological surveys to allocate sites to appropriate use categories, develop protection measures, and integrate survey results into research designs and interpretation efforts.
- Complete documentary research and oral histories to gain a better understanding of cultural resources associated with homesteading, mining, ranching, and other historical period activities.
- Establish collaborative research partnerships with academic institutions, professional and non-profit organizations, and advocational organizations. Provide opportunities for volunteer training and participation in site documentation, research, protection, and educational projects.
- Continue to consult with the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, Colorado River Indian Tribes, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, Hopi Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe, and other interested Indian tribes to identify places of traditional importance and associated access needs. Develop measures for management and protection of such places that may be identified by tribes during the life of the RMP.
- Honor tribal requests to protect the confidentiality of sensitive information to the extent permitted by law.
- Restrict public information about the specific locations of sites that are not allocated to public use (selected for interpretive and educational uses).
- Coordinate with state governments, tribes, and other governmental entities (under existing agreements and any new arrangements deemed necessary) to disseminate and exchange information and cooperate in Management Actions consistent with applicable legal authorities and other directives.
- Provide opportunities for Native American participation in research and interpretation.
- Continue to participate in educational outreach efforts that highlight the values of cultural heritage resources and the need to protect the resources.
- Implement procedures for systematic monitoring of all sites developed or authorized for public visitation.

- Require that holders of special recreation permits provide site visitors with appropriate educational information on archaeological site etiquette and resource conservation
- Continue support of the Site Steward Program, Proposed Plan Alternative 1.
- Develop cultural resource protection systems for selected cultural resources that have either a high level of significance or a history of vandalism.
- Reduce or eliminate indirect impacts of land uses on cultural resources as identified through study plots.
- Provide immediate and long-term in-place preservation and protection of selected cultural resources that are threatened or deteriorating.
- Specific management prescriptions for the sites managed for Traditional Use would be developed in consultation with the Indian tribes to which they are culturally important.
- BLM would identify sacred areas in consultation with Indian tribes and, where practicable, limit land uses to those that do not conflict with ascribed values.
- BLM would identify sacred areas or sites within the Crossman Peak Natural Scenic Area or ACEC in consultation with Indian tribes and, where practicable, limit land uses to those that do not conflict with ascribed values.
- Nominate eligible properties to NRHP.
- All previously submitted NRHP nominations would be evaluated, and those that merit listing would be resubmitted.
- Additional sites determined to be significant would be nominated to NRHP. Possible sites include petroglyphs, pictographs, previously unidentified intaglios, and large habitation sites.
- Conduct mapping and site documentation prior to interpretive development or use for commercial tours to the extent needed to preserve archaeological data, plan for interpretive facilities, and provide a baseline condition assessment for monitoring changes associated with visitor use.
- Identify priority areas for inventory.
- Define priority areas for new field inventories (Section 110 surveys) based primarily on imminent threats or land use conflicts in areas having a relatively high probability for significant sites.
- If appropriate and feasible, amend the Recreation and Public Purposes Act (R&PP) leases to preserve and protect any identified significant cultural resources.

In accordance with 60 FR 53194-53195, BLM would:

- Limit camping and fires at Swansea Townsite to designated campgrounds.
- Prohibit firewood collection within the town site at Swansea.
- Prohibit driving in Swansea Townsite except on designated open and signed routes.

Rangeland Management/Grazing

The Bureau's objectives for rangeland management are to carry out the intent of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended and supplemented, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, and the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978. This is: 1) to periodically and systematically inventory public lands and their resources and their present and future use projected through land use planning processes; 2) to manage public lands on the basis of multiple use and sustained yield; 3) to manage public lands in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource, and archaeological values; 4) where appropriate, to preserve and protect certain public lands in their natural condition; 5) to provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife and domestic animals; 6) to provide for outdoor recreation and human occupancy and use; and 7) to manage, maintain and improve the condition of the public rangelands so that they become as productive as feasible for all rangeland values in accordance with management objectives and the land use planning process.

The Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) was revised upon the issuance of the Department of Interior's Final Rule for Grazing Administration in 1995. The Final Rule revised 43 CFR 4100 regulations relating to grazing administration for the BLM. Among other things, the regulations now require the implementation of standards and guidelines to achieve the fundamentals of rangeland health.

The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 provides for two types of authorized use on public lands (1) A Grazing Permit is a document authorizing use of the public lands within an established grazing district. Grazing districts are specific area within which the public lands are administered in accordance with section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act and (2) Grazing lease is a document authorizing use of the public lands outside an established grazing district. Public lands outside of grazing district boundaries are administered in accordance with section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act.

A permit or lease will include:

1. The number and kind of livestock;
2. The period(s) of use;
3. The allotment(s) to be used; and
4. The amount of use, in Animal Unit Months (AUMs).

The Special Ephemeral Rule published December 7, 1968 (See Appendix F) allows a variance to the mandatory stipulations above. The permit or lease does not specify number and kind of livestock, period of use, or the amount of use in AUMs. The rule establishes that on applicable grazing lands, livestock grazing is feasible when certain climatic conditions create favorable conditions for grazing, primarily on annual vegetation. When these conditions occur, and the permittee or lessee applies for grazing use, the BLM determines the amount and period of authorized use. Such use is authorized when forage is available and there is a high probability that the forage will continue to be available through the period applied for and authorized.

The regulations at 43 CFR 4100 require that permits and leases include terms and conditions that ensure conformance with Subpart 4180 of the grazing regulations

Other terms and conditions may be specified in grazing permits or leases, which will assist in achieving management objectives, provide for proper range management or assist in the orderly administration of the public rangelands. Refer to the grazing regulations for examples.

Terms and conditions for grazing permits and leases must be in conformance with resource and management objectives and program constraints, as identified in land use plans.

BLM allotments in Arizona are classified as Perennial, Ephemeral, or Perennial-Ephemeral. These classifications correspond to the following types of designated rangelands:

- Perennial - Rangeland that consistently produces perennial forage to support a year round livestock operation.
- Ephemeral - Rangelands within the Hot Desert Biome (Region) that do not consistently produce enough forage to sustain a livestock operation but may briefly produce unusual volumes of forage to accommodate livestock grazing (43 CFR 4100.0-5). Use is authorized in accordance with the Special Ephemeral Rule.
- Perennial-Ephemeral - range that produces perennial forage each year and also periodically provides additional ephemeral vegetation. In a year of abundant moisture and favorable climatic conditions, annual forbs and grasses add materially to the total grazing capacity.

These rangelands are located in portions of the Chihuahuan, Colorado, Mojave, and Sonoran Deserts.

Desired Future Conditions Common to All Alternatives

Provide forage on a sustain yield basis for livestock consistent with meeting Land Health Standards and multiple use objectives. Healthy, sustainable rangeland ecosystems would be maintained or improved to meet Land Health Standards (Arizona's Standards for Rangeland Health (1997); and produce a wide range of public values such as wildlife habitat, livestock forage, recreation opportunities, clean water, and functional watersheds.

Livestock use and associated management practices would be conducted in a manner consistent with other multiple use needs and objectives to ensure that the health of rangeland resources is preserved or improved so that they are productive for all rangeland values. Where needed, public rangeland ecosystems would be improved to meet objectives.

Land Use Allocations

Land Use Allocation decisions related to livestock grazing are whether or not lands are available for livestock grazing. Note that allotments that are managed by adjacent field offices with public lands inside Lake Havasu would not be effected, as allocations for these allotments would be made in RMP revisions for these field offices. Table 2-6 displays the acreage open or closed by alternative.

Table 2-6. Livestock Grazing Land Use Allocation by Alternative

Acreages	Alternatives			
	1	2	3	4 and 5 (Preferred)
Open	1,148,743	213,731	1,148,743	1,121,701
Closed	211,022	1,146,034	211,022	238,064
Total Acres	1,359,765	1,359,765	1,359,765	1,359,765

Note: These allocations are shown on Maps 2-3, 2-4, and 2-5

Management Actions/Prescriptions Common to All Alternatives

Guidelines for grazing administration apply to all livestock grazing activities on BLM administered-lands.

Arizona Guidelines for Grazing Administration

The Arizona Guidelines for Grazing Administration are a series of management practices used to ensure that grazing activities meet the Land Health Standards.

Guidelines for Standard 1

1-1. Management activities will maintain or promote ground cover that will provide for infiltration, permeability, soil moisture storage, and soil stability appropriate for the ecological sites within management units. The ground cover should maintain soil organisms and plants and animals to support the hydrologic and nutrient cycles, and energy flow. Ground cover and signs of erosion are surrogate measures for hydrologic and nutrient cycles and energy flow.

1-2. When grazing practices alone are not likely to restore areas of low infiltration or permeability, land management treatments may be designed and implemented to attain improvement.

Guidelines for Standard 2

2-1. Management practices maintain or promote sufficient vegetation to maintain, improve or restore riparian-wetland functions of energy dissipation, sediment capture, groundwater recharge and stream bank stability, thus promoting stream channel morphology (e.g., gradient, width/depth ratio, channel roughness and sinuosity) and functions appropriate to climate and landform.

2-2. New facilities are located away from riparian-wetland areas if they conflict with achieving or maintaining riparian-wetland function. Existing facilities are used in a way that does not conflict with riparian-wetland functions or are relocated or modified when incompatible with riparian-wetland functions.

2-3. The development of springs and seeps or other projects affecting water and associated resources shall be designed to protect ecological functions and processes.

Guidelines for Standard 3

3-1. The use and perpetuation of native species will be emphasized. However, when restoring or rehabilitating disturbed or degraded rangelands, non-intrusive, non-native plant species are appropriate for use where native species (a) are not available, (b) are not economically feasible, (c) cannot achieve ecological objectives as well as non-native species, and/or (d) cannot compete with already established non-native species.

3-2. Conservation of Federal threatened or endangered, proposed, candidate, and other special status species is promoted by the maintenance or restoration of their habitats.

3-3. Management practices maintain, restore, or enhance water quality in conformance with State or Federal standards.

3-4. Intensity, season and frequency of use, and distribution of grazing use should provide for growth and reproduction of those plant species needed to reach desired plant community objectives.

3-5. Grazing on designated ephemeral (annual and perennial) rangeland may be authorized if the following conditions are met:

- ephemeral vegetation is present in draws, washes, and under shrubs and has grown to useable levels at the time grazing begins;
- sufficient surface and subsurface soil moisture exists for continued plant growth;
- serviceable waters are capable of providing for proper grazing distribution;
- sufficient annual vegetation will remain on site to satisfy other resource concerns, (i.e., watershed, wildlife, wild horses and burros); and
- monitoring is conducted during grazing to determine if objectives are being met.

3-6. Management practices will target those populations of noxious weeds that can be controlled or eliminated by approved methods.

3-7. Management practices to achieve desired plant communities will consider protection and conservation of known cultural resources, including historical sites, and prehistoric sites and plants of significance to Native American peoples.

Criteria for Classifying Allotments as Ephemeral

Allotments may be classified as Ephemeral in accordance with the Special Ephemeral Rule published December 7, 1968. BLM has established criteria based upon the Special Rule through which allotments can be classified as ephemeral. These criteria include:

1. Rangelands are within the hot desert biome.
2. Average annual precipitation is less than 8 inches.
3. Rangelands produce less than 25 pounds per acre of desirable forage grasses.
4. The vegetative community is composed of less than 5% desirable forage species.
5. The rangelands are generally below 3,500 feet in elevation.
6. Annual production is highly unpredictable and forage availability is of a short duration.
7. Usable forage production depends on abundant moisture and other favorable climatic conditions.
8. Rangelands lack potential to improve existing ecological status and produce a dependable supply of forage through intensive rangeland management practices.

Administrative Actions

Land health standard evaluations would continue on all grazing allotments in accordance with established schedules, grazing regulations and policies. When completing land health evaluations, the criteria for classification as ephemeral will be reviewed as part of the evaluation.

Range improvement projects would be authorized on a case-by-case basis, in accordance with grazing regulations and policies.

Lands and Realty Program

More than 1.3 million acres of federally owned lands are under BLM administration in the LHFO planning area. The Lands and Realty program consists generally of two distinct segments: Land tenure and use authorization. The land tenure segment focuses on acquiring and disposing of lands or interests in lands. The land use authorization segment focuses on public demand requests for rights-of-way, permits, leases, and easements. Land tenure and use authorization for LHFO are addressed below.

Land Tenure

The land tenure segment of the Lands and Realty program specifies that LHFO will (1) retain all public lands or interests in land that enhance multiple use management, (2) acquire lands or interests in land that complement important resource values and further management objectives, and (3) dispose of lands or interests in lands that are difficult or uneconomical to manage or are no longer needed for federal purposes.

Land Management

LHFO would continue to have responsibility for Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) projects lands pursuant to an Interagency Agreement of March 23, 1983, and the guidelines of 613 Department Manual 1 (DM1). About 80,000 acres (see Map 2-6), of land within the planning area are BOR lands, withdrawn from the public lands or acquired from non-federal owners to accommodate BOR projects along the lower Colorado River. BLM may not dispose of any of these lands without written approval of BOR.

Split estate is property for which the surface estate is owned by one entity and the mineral estate is owned by another entity. For purposes of the Lands and Realty program, split estate refers to federal government ownership of the surface estate and ownership of the mineral estate by another entity. In this situation, BLM may attempt to acquire the mineral estate from the owner(s). For situations in which the federal government owns the mineral estate and another entity owns the surface, see the “Mineral Resources” section of this RMP.

Land Acquisition

LHFO may acquire lands or interests in lands by purchase using Land and Water Conservation Fund funds or through other funding. BLM may also acquire lands from donations or exchanges. See Appendix G for legal description of lands identified for acquisition in Alternative 1 (No Action).

Acquisition of non-federal lands would be prioritized based on the potential to enhance the conservation and management of threatened or endangered species habitat, riparian habitat, desert tortoise habitat, key big game habitat, or improve the overall manageability of wildlife habitat.

Land Disposal

BLM may dispose of lands or interests through sales, exchanges, conveyance of mineral interests, Recreation and Public Purposes Act (R&PP) leases/patents.

BLM may also use withdrawals in which jurisdiction of the land or interests in lands are transferred to another federal agency. If LHFO discovers an area that needs the protection of a withdrawal, the withdrawal will be processed. If other agencies withdrawals are revoked, BLM will manage the land consistently with the current land use plan.

- Public lands may have potential for disposal when they are isolated and/or difficult to manage. Disposal actions are usually in response to public request or application that results in a title transfer, wherein the lands leave the public domain. All public lands will be retained unless specifically identified for disposal. The criteria for land disposals are listed below;
- Public lands classified, withdrawn, reserved, or otherwise designated as not available or subject to sale are unavailable. A land use plan amendment would be required to dispose of lands not identified for disposal in the current land use plan. All disposal actions are coordinated with adjoining landowners, local governments, and current land users.
- There are two distinct sets of criteria in FLPMA for evaluating whether disposal will serve the national interest. One set is for disposal by sale and the other is for disposal by exchange:
 1. Land disposal by public sale is addressed in Section 203(a) of FLPMA. This section contains three criteria to apply in identifying public lands suitable for disposal by public sale. The criteria, as paraphrased, are that a) the tract of public land is difficult and uneconomical to manage as part of the public lands and is not suitable for management by another federal department or agency, b) the land is no longer required for a specific purpose, or c) disposal will serve important public objectives.
 2. The criteria for determining which public lands or land interests are available for disposal by exchange are covered in Section 206(a) of FLPMA. These criteria require BLM to consider the public interest by giving full consideration to better federal land management and the needs of state and local people. These include the need of lands for the economy, community expansion, recreation areas, food, fiber, minerals, and fish and wildlife. The criteria also require that the public objectives to be served must be greater on the lands to be acquired than on the lands to be conveyed.

LHFO may dispose of land or interests in land under the Desert Land Entry Act of 1877 or the Indian Allotment Act of 1887. Because no lands have been identified as meeting the criteria for entry under these authorities, none are available for disposal under either authority.

- The Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act of 1954, as amended, authorizes the lease and/or conveyance of BLM-administered lands for recreational or public purposes to state and local governments and to qualified nonprofit organizations under specified conditions at less than the fair market value.
- The Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 provides for the conveyance of BLM-administered lands to public agencies for use as airports and airways.

Disposal criteria with respect to Endangered Species Act listed, proposed, or candidate species and critical habitat are as follows:

- BLM will not transfer out of federal ownership designated or proposed critical habitat for a listed or proposed threatened or endangered species.
- BLM will not transfer out of federal ownership lands supporting listed or proposed threatened or endangered species if such transfer would be inconsistent with recovery

needs and objectives or would likely affect the recovery of the listed or proposed species.

- BLM will not transfer out of federal ownership lands supporting federal candidate species if such action would contribute to the need to list the species as threatened or endangered.

Exceptions to the three previous criteria could occur if the recipient of the lands would protect the species or critical habitat equally well under the Endangered Species Act, such as disposal to a nonfederal governmental agency or private organization if conservation purposes for the species would still be achieved and ensured.

In addition, the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of 2000, commonly referred to as the Baca Bill, allows BLM to retain receipts from land sales to cover administrative costs and acquire properties. Section 205 of the Act requires that the public land be identified for disposal in an approved land use plan as of July 25, 2000. All the lands identified for disposal in Alternative 1 meet the requirements of the Act. Some of the Baca lands carried forth to the other Alternatives. Those Baca lands identified for disposal in the other Alternatives are identified by an asterisk in Appendix G.

LHFO could also dispose of land or interests in land under the Desert Land Entry Act, the Carey Act, or the Indian Allotment Act. However, because no lands have been identified as meeting the criteria under these authorities, none are available for such disposal.

The Territory of Arizona was established on February 24, 1863, by an Act of Congress. This Act granted sections 16 and 36 of each township for the benefit of Common Schools. Congress also passed the State Enabling Act on June 20, 1910. In addition to the previously designated sections of land, the Enabling Act assigned sections 2 and 32 of each township to be held in trust for the Common Schools. The needs of other public institutions were also considered by Congress and through the Enabling Act and other Acts of Congress, the State of Arizona (State) was to receive approximately 10,900,000 acres of federal lands.

The State acquired its four township Common School sections wherever the land surveys place them. However, in some townships the Common School sections were not available to the State because they had been homesteaded or for other reasons. To ensure that the State received the full amount of land identified for transfer Congress passed legislation that allowed the State to choose (indemnity lieu selection) other federal lands.

The Territory and Enabling Acts left the State with ownership of many scattered noncontiguous parcels. Therefore, the BLM and the Arizona State Land Department have worked and continue to work together to facilitate resource management. To this end the agencies have consolidated their respective land through land exchanges. However, in the late 1980s, the Arizona Supreme Court ruled that the current language of the Arizona Constitution does not allow the State to exchange its land for other Federal land. Therefore, until the people of the State vote to amend Arizona's Constitution, the State cannot exchange land with BLM.

Considerations for Land Use Allocations (acquisitions) for each alternative are shown below in Table 2-7. A summary of the land use tenure (disposals) for each alternative is

shown in Table 2-8. Considerations for Land Use Allocations (disposals) for each alternative are shown below in Table 2-9.

Maps 2-7, 2-8, 2-9, and 2-10 show the lands identified for disposal for the different alternatives. The legal descriptions for these alternatives and the existing R&PP leases are listed in Appendix G. Map 2-6 shows the BOR acquired and withdrawn lands managed by BLM.

Table 2-7. Land Use Allocations (Acquisitions)**Alternative 1 (No Action)**

The following decisions are derived from the 1987 *Yuma District Resource Management Plan* (YRMP) as amended and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:

LHFO will attempt to expand the Bill Williams Riparian Management Area from 1,720 acres to 5,440 acres through the acquisition of private lands along the Bill Williams River.

Additional private lands will be identified for acquisition to benefit federal programs. Since 1987, the YRMP identified 14,750 acres.

The Yuma District will attempt to acquire 13,632 acres through exchange to benefit Federal programs. These lands will be open to mineral entry and development in accordance with mining law and regulations.

Land acquisitions will be considered on a case-by-case basis through exchange, purchase, or donation.

There will be no acquisition of private or state land for grazing purposes.

The Yuma District will attempt to acquire through exchange 8,280 acres of State and private lands adjacent to or encompassed by priority wildlife areas.

BLM will attempt to acquire approximately 9,580 acres of private lands within Category I and II desert tortoise habitat areas through purchase or exchange.

The following decisions are derived from the 1995 *Kingman Resource Area Resource Management Plan* (KRMP) and are applicable only to those lands covered by the KRMP:

BLM will acquire 2,360 acres of state and 8,040 acres of private lands (surface and subsurface).

BLM will retain and acquire lands not identified for disposal, including areas of blocked public ownership.

Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 (Preferred)

Acquisition of lands, including non-federal minerals, would be considered if:

1. the lands are free and clear of any hazardous materials, structures, or legal encumbrances;
2. the owners are willing to sell or exchange or donate, and
3. one or more of following criteria apply:
 - Inholdings encompassed within the boundaries of special designated areas (ACEC, WA, Wilderness Study Area [WSA], National Trails, proposed Wild and Scenic River, and so forth) as designated in this RMP.
 - Properties adjacent to public lands that contain significant cultural resources including, but not limited to, those properties eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Priority acquisitions would be for lands that contain portions of eligible sites also located on public lands.
 - Lands made available by willing non-federal landowners that are within Category 1 and II desert tortoise habitat and/or would improve the status of desert tortoise by protecting areas large enough to support viable populations of desert tortoise.
 - Properties within wildlife habitat management areas as allocated in this RMP.
 - Properties adjacent to wildlife habitat management areas where the species are jeopardized by future proposed activities.
 - Properties with important wildlife corridors or properties that provide for continuity of important wildlife corridors where links between fragmented habitats would be made available for movement of species.
 - Properties within or adjacent to Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA) or Recreation Management Zones, or that enhance recreational opportunities available on

Table 2-7. Land Use Allocations (Acquisitions)

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 (Preferred)
	<p>adjacent public lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lands that provide connectivity for trails or routes. ▪ Properties within areas with high wilderness characteristics as described in this RMP (Alternatives s two and four only). ▪ Properties that would consolidate public ownership for the benefit of a resource program.
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	<p>LHFO could acquire conservation easements to protect resources within the special area designations, Wildlife Habitat Areas (WHAs), cultural resource sites, and Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs).</p>

Table 2-8. Land Use Allocations (Disposals): Acreages by Land Tenure Category

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Current Leases for Disposal under R&PP Act (acres)				
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	2,934	2,934	2,934	2,934
Land Available for Sale, Exchange, and R&PP Leasing and Disposal (acres)				
51,949	31,225	80,541	53,781	53,781
Total Acreage				
51,949	34,159	83,475	56,715	56,715

Table 2-9. Land Use Allocations (Disposals)

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1987 YRMP as amended and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>After various land disposal actions the YRMP still has approximately 15,751 acres of land available for disposal through exchange or sale with exchange being the preferred method of disposal.</p> <p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1995 KRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the KRMP:</i></p> <p>BLM would designate approximately 11,974 acres of public land for disposal, preferably through exchange, near growing communities for the purposes of community development, mine expansion, industrial development, etc. The primary acquisition areas are private lands high in resource values, such as wilderness inholdings, and</p>	<p>Approximately 34,159 acres would be available for potential disposal. This includes R&PP Leased Lands. See Map 2-8 for location[s] and Appendix G for legal descriptions.¹</p>	<p>Approximately 83,475 acres for potential disposal. This includes R&PP Leased Lands. See Map 2-9 for location[s] and Appendix G for legal descriptions.²</p>	<p>Approximately 56,715 acres would be available for potential disposal. This includes R&PP Leased Lands. See Map 2-10 for location[s] and Appendix G for legal descriptions.³</p>	

1 This figure is a combination of most of the acres of Alternative 1 plus about 2,917 acres of R&PP-leased land. Approximately 20,724 acres that were identified in Alternative 1 were removed from the disposal list because they conflicted with other BLM programs.

2 This includes some of the land identified in Alternative 2, the R&PP leased lands, parcels of federal land identified by the public, and recommendations by the LHFO staff. Lands identified by the public were included if they were within the boundaries of the RMP, included a legal description, or were shown on a map in such a manner that BLM could determine the legal description. If the land(s) identified for disposal were on Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) lands managed by BLM under 613 Department Manual 1, they were included if BOR currently has no objections to their disposal. The LHFO staff also identified public lands that met the criteria for disposal. The criteria include, but are not limited to, those lands that are difficult to manage and parcels near communities that would allow for community expansion.

3 Staff removed about 26,760 acres, identified for disposal in Alternatives 3, because they conflicted with other BLM programs. These programs include but are not limited to rangeland/grazing, wildlife and special area designations.

Table 2-9. Land Use Allocations (Disposals)

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
those lands identified in (LR01/B1).				
<i>The following decision is derived from the 1983 LGNMFP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the LGNMFP:</i>				
The LGNMFP recommends approximately 17,472 acres for disposal.				
<i>The following decision is derived from the 1985 LGSRMP (Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan) and is applicable only to those lands covered by the LGSRMP:</i>				
Approximately 6,752 acres of public land within the planning unit will be available for either state or private exchange, or transferred under special legislation or public sale. These lands are identified in Appendix H of the final RMP/EIS.				
A review of the four Management Plans indicates that a total of approximately 51,949 acres remain available for disposal. The Map 2-7 shows the general location for Alternative 1 and Appendix H for the legal description.				

Table 2-9. Land Use Allocations (Disposals)

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1987 YRMP as amended and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>As part of the land ownership adjustment program for lands covered under the former Yuma RMP, LHFO would seek to consolidate surface and subsurface (mineral) estates under one ownership whenever possible. This practice would eliminate potential problems associated with split estate land and thereby improve manageability of the federal, state, or privately owned lands involved. Split estate consolidation would be achieved by exchanges with the states or private owners and in accordance with guidelines delineated in Section 206 of FLPMA. Any lands acquired by BLM would include both the surface and the mineral estate whenever possible.</p> <p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1995 KRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the KRMP:</i></p> <p>BLM would dispose of federal minerals underlying state and private land and acquire nonfederal minerals underlying public lands to eliminate split estate property.</p> <p>BLM would acquire the following non-federal minerals and close to mineral entry: T. 20 N., R. 21 W., sections 32 (S½) and 33 (all), and T. 19 N., R. 21 W., sections 5</p>	<p>BLM would dispose of federal minerals underlying state and private land and acquire nonfederal minerals underlying public lands to eliminate split estate property. Any lands acquired by BLM would include both the surface and the mineral estate whenever possible.</p>			

Table 2-9. Land Use Allocations (Disposals)

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p>(all), 7 (E½, NW¼, N½SW¼), 9 (all).</p> <p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1985 LGSRMP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the LGSRMP:</i></p> <p>BLM would acquire approximately 7,360 acres of state/private minerals and dispose of approximately 11,170 acres of federal minerals that underlie state or privately owned surface estates. The mineral estates to be acquired and disposed of are listed in Appendix G.</p>				

Use Authorization

LHFO may allow the use of the public lands or interests in lands through issuance of ROWs, leases, and permits. The types of uses that would be authorized by a ROW issued pursuant to FLPMA would include access roads, power lines, telephone lines, fiber optic systems, communications facilities, and so forth. Examples of uses authorized pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act include crude oil pipelines and oil and gas pipelines. Typical uses authorized by permits would include filming and establishing and maintaining apiary sites. Table 2-10 shows the existing Use Authorization decisions and the proposed modification of those decisions. Use authorization would include the appropriate mitigation.

To minimize adverse environmental impacts and the proliferation of separate ROWs, the utilization of shared ROWs will be required to the extent practical. Any existing transportation and utility corridors may be designated as transportation and utility corridors pursuant to FLPMA Section 503 [43 USC 1763] without further review. Table 2-11 is a summary of the existing corridors and the proposed adjustments for each alternative. Table 2-12 lists the Corridor Specifications for each alternative. Table 2-13 shows the written analysis of the various alternatives of the corridors.

Public lands may also be designated for use as a communications site or a communications facility. A communications facility is a building and/or tower or other physical improvement that is built, installed, or established to house and support authorized communications uses. LHFO communications sites accommodate the wireless systems referred to in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 as well as many other uses, including AM/FM broadcast facilities, commercial mobile radios, private mobile radios, and microwaves on designated communications sites located on mountaintops. Table 2-14 lists the communication sites and the recommendations under each alternative.

As stated in Executive Order 13212, the Energy Project Streamlining process requires expediting production, transportation, and conservation of energy. The preferred action of the programmatic environmental impact statement (PEIS) *Wind Energy Development Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* (Bureau of Land Management June 2005.) is the limited wind energy development alternative, which would allow additional wind energy development on BLM-administered lands only where it currently exists or is under development, or where it is approved for development at the time the Record of Decision for this PEIS is published. Future expansion of wind energy development would be restricted to six specific areas; however, no additional BLM-administered lands would be opened up for development. Current requirements for processing applications for wind energy site testing and for monitoring and commercial wind energy development projects are set forth in BLM's 2002 Interim Wind Energy Development Policy (IM No. 2003-020).

The BLM Washington Office issued IM 2001-142, which instructed BLM to expedite the processing of all energy-related actions in the most efficient manner without jeopardizing significant resources or violating any of the environmental laws. The analysis conducted in the *Wind Energy Development Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* (Bureau of Land Management in prep.) supports the amendment of specific lands use plans where potentially developable wind resources are located.

Table 2-10. Use Authorization

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 (Preferred)
Agricultural lands that are not leased will revert to uses that would benefit other programs carried out by the Yuma District, such as development for recreational use and return to natural condition for use as wildlife habitat.	When lands currently managed under agricultural lease no longer are authorized for agricultural use they would revert to uses that would benefit other programs carried out by BLM or return to natural condition for use as wildlife habitat in accordance with the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP)
BLM would continue to lease recreation areas for concessions, state parks, and county parks to ensure that recreation opportunities are provided for the public. Private enterprise will continue to provide services and facilities that are responsive to public needs and are appropriate in intensively developed public lands through concession leases.	BLM would continue to lease recreation areas for concessions, state parks, county parks, and city parks in accordance with the desired Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) settings.
No sand and gravel permits or new utility ROWs would be authorized in the three areas managed under special prescriptions. No additional utility ROWs would be authorized in the Crossman Peak Natural Scenic area; except applications for terminal utility distribution lines to serve private land may be accepted and considered to the extent needed to provide reasonable access pursuant to federal law.	Within the boundaries of Special Area Designations (such as but not limited to: ACEC, WSA, proposed Wild and Scenic Rivers, etc.) as identified in this RMP, no new utility and roads ROWs would be authorized, with the exception of utilities and access roads that provide service to nonfederal land within these areas. One additional ROW would be issued in the proposed Crossman Peak ACEC to authorize an existing building and two towers on public land in T. 14 N., R. 19 W. section 13, lot 1.
Locating facilities outside of designated corridors and communications sites would be avoided in priority wildlife habitat areas. In the Bill Williams Riparian Management Area, no additional mineral material removal permits or ROWs will be authorized. Off-highway vehicle use will continue to be limited to existing roads and trails (YRMP Amend #3).	Locating facilities outside of designated corridors and communications sites would be avoided in WHAs if practicable.

Table 2-11. ROW Corridors Designations Summary (See Maps 2-11, 2-12, 2-13, and 2-14)

Preferred Alternative	ROW Corridor/Location	Width in Miles	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Alternative 4	California Desert Conservation Area "F" (CA) (UC-1)	1	Identified	Rerouted and designated		Dropped
Alternatives 3 and 4	Western Utility Group (WUG 1) (new)	1	N/A	N/A	Designated	
Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	Interstate 40 (UC-3)	1–2	Identified	Rerouted and designated		
	Davis-Parker "A" (UC-2A)	1				
	Parker-Blaisdell "B" (UC-6B)	1				
	Parker-Liberty (UC-5)	1–2				
	Central Arizona Project (CAP) (LGN-2)	1	Designated	Rerouted and designated		
	Bouse-Salome [Adjust] (LGN-1)	1		Rerouted, adjust and designated		
	El Paso Natural Gas (LGN-11)	2	Identified	Rerouted and designated		
	San Juan Crossover (UC-4)	1		Designated		
Alternatives 1 thru 4	Interstate 10 (UC-7)	1	Designated			
	Bouse-Harcuvar (LGN-3)	1				
	Little Harquahala (LGN-4)	1				
	Wenden-Wickenburg (LGN-5)	1				
Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	State Route 60 (UC-8) (new)	1	N/A	Designated		
Alternatives 3 and 4	Western Utility Group (WUG 2) (new)	1	N/A	N/A	Designated	

Table 2-12. Corridors (Specifications)

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
New utility and communication facilities would be located in designated corridors and sites unless an evaluation of the project shows that location outside of a designated area is the only practicable alternative.	New utility facilities would be located in designated corridors unless an evaluation of the project shows that location outside of a designated area is the only practicable alternative.			
Locating facilities outside of designated corridors and communications sites would be prohibited in special management areas.	Locating utility facilities outside of designated corridors and communications sites would be prohibited in Special Area Designations.			
Locating facilities outside of designated corridors and communications sites would be avoided in priority wildlife habitat areas.	Locating utility facilities outside of designated corridors and communications sites would be avoided in priority wildlife habitat areas.			
Nine existing and proposed ROWs (214 miles in total) would be designated as utility corridors to accommodate recent and future development needs. These designated corridors apply to BLM-administered lands only. BLM would establish the four multiple-use utility corridors along existing ROWs in LHFO. In these corridors, all utility uses (including transportation, pipelines, and electrical transmission lines) will be allowed when the uses are compatible.	In utility corridors, uses including but not limited to transportation, pipelines, and electrical transmission lines will be allowed when the uses are compatible. These designated corridors apply only to BLM-administered lands.			

Table 2-13. Corridors Dropped, Designated, and Rerouted

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Portions of the Parker-Liberty, California Desert Conservation Area “F,” (UC-1) Davis-Parker “A,” (UC2A) and Parker-Blaisdell (UC-6B) corridors are constrained or routed to protect natural values and to promote consistency with other government agencies.	UC-1 Rerouted out of Dead Mountain Wilderness	UC-1 Rerouted out of Dead Mountain Wilderness; adjacent to WUG 1	UC-1 Dropped because of proximity to WUG 1 and because it does not connect to any northern corridors	
Western Utility Group (WUG 1) not addressed in existing plan.	NA	WUG 1 Designated because it connects to existing northern corridors		
Portions of the Parker-Liberty, California Desert Conservation Area “F,” (UC-1) Davis-Parker “A,” (UC2A) and Parker-Blaisdell (UC-6B) corridors are constrained or routed to protect natural values and to promote consistency with other government agencies.		UC2A Designated and rerouted. This corridor was rerouted so that it avoids the Needles Wilderness.		
Portions of the Parker-Liberty, California Desert Conservation Area “F,” (UC-1) Davis-Parker “A,” (UC2A) and Parker-Blaisdell (UC-6B) corridors are constrained or routed to protect natural values and to promote consistency with other government agencies.		UC-6B Designated and rerouted. This corridor was rerouted around Black Peak so that it avoids a significant Native American site. It was also widened to a 1-mile width from a 0.5-mile width south of Black Peak.		
Interstate 40 UC-3 connects to corridors managed primarily by the Needles Field Office. Portions of the current route go through the Needles Wilderness.		Interstate 40 UC-3 Designated and Rerouted out of Needles Wilderness.		
Establish the Parker to Liberty (UC-5) corridor with strict control on the placement of the future rights-of-way. Future rights-of-way will be constructed as closely as possible to existing structures to lessen impacts to the sand dune habitat. The Parker-Liberty (UC-5) corridor narrows to 330 feet where it passes adjacent lambing grounds in the Buckskins Mountains.		UC-5 Designated and Rerouted. This corridor was rerouted so that it avoids the Gibraltar Mountain and East Cactus Plain Wildernesses. A portion of this corridor has a width of 2 miles to accommodate projects that also use other corridors such as LGN-3, LGN-4, LGN-5, and LGN-11. The segment that is 2 miles in width was reduced by approximately 10 miles in length and now stops at the northern boundary of corridor LGN-3. The corridor is being widened to 1,100 feet for usability. Even at this greater width, the corridor still avoids the lambing grounds in the Buckskin Mountains.		
Establish the CAP corridor with a 1-mile-wide corridor. All new ROWs will be issued south of the existing aqueduct.		CAP (LGN-2) Designated and rerouted. The route of this corridor was changed so that projects can occur on both sides of the canal. This change allows New projects to avoid crossing the canal.		
Bouse-Salome (LGN-1). This corridor stops near the community of Bouse		LGN-1 Designated, Adjusted and rerouted. This corridor was adjusted to		

Table 2-13. Corridors Dropped, Designated, and Rerouted

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
AZ.		connect to UC-6B near Parker South AZ and rerouted to avoid the Cactus Plain WSA.		
El Paso Natural Gas. Establish a 2-mile-wide El Paso Natural Gas Company (LGN-11) corridor, reducing the size of the corridor to 1 mile in width at the Bill Williams River crossing.		LGN-11 Designated and rerouted. This corridor connects to the 1-mile-wide San Juan Crossover (UC-4) on the south side of the Bill Williams River. Currently this corridor has a width of 2 miles intended to accommodate projects that also use other corridors such as LGN-3, LGN-4, LGN-5, and UC-5. At approximately the meeting point of T. 7 and 8 N., R. 13 W. these corridor divide and go in different directions. At this point LGN-11 width was reduced to 1 mile The corridor was rerouted so that it no longer runs through the Rawhide Wilderness.		
San Juan Crossover (UC-4).		<u>UC-4 Designated.</u> This 1-mile-wide corridor starts and ends on the south side of the Bill Williams where it connects to LGN-11.		
Interstate 10 (UC-7). Bouse-Harcuvar (LGN-3). Little Harquahala (LGN-4). Wenden-Wickenburg (LGN-5).		<u>Continue with Designated</u> UC-7, LGN-3, LGN-4, LGN-5 (Alternative 1).		
Not specifically addressed in previous plans		<u>Designated UC-8.</u> This is a new corridor. It has a width of 1 mile and connects to LGN-4 and UC-7.		
Not specifically addressed in previous plans		<u>Designated WUG 2.</u> This is a new corridor that connects to I-40.		

Table 2-14. Communication Sites: Designated, Renamed, and Undesignated

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Smith Peak Communication Site (CS)-4. Not addressed in Land Use Plans (LUPs)			Designated	
Citizens Utilities/Mohave Mountain (CS-1): Designated			Designated/renamed	
Black Peak (CS-3): Designated			Undesignated	
American Cable TV (CS-2): Designated			Undesignated	
Alamo Dam (CS-6): Not addressed in LUPs			Designated	
Four communications sites, totaling 21 acres, would be designated to accommodate present and future needs. The designated sites and their acreages are listed in Table 26 of the former Yuma RMP and shown on Map 2-11.	<p>These Alternatives would carry over two designated communications sites, and designate one new site. The communications sites are listed in the above and shown on Maps 2-12, 2-13, and 2-14. The Alamo Dam site represents the new communications site. The designated Citizens Utilities site would be renamed the Mohave Mountain communications site.</p> <p>This Alternative would also undesignate the American Cable TV and Black Peak communication sites.</p>			
All communication facilities on Black Peak — one of the nine sites proposed for designation under Alternative 5—would be phased out and relocated at a suitable site through negotiation with the Colorado River Indian Tribes and the site lessees.	All communication facilities on Black Peak would be phased out and relocated at a suitable site through negotiation with the Colorado River Indian Tribes and the site lessees.			
Locating facilities outside of designated corridors and communications sites would be prohibited in special management areas.	Locating communication facilities outside of designated corridors and communication sites would be prohibited in ACECs, WAs, WSAs, WHAs, SRMAs, and nationally eligible cultural sites Alternatives 2, 3, & 4			
New utility and communication facilities would be located in designated corridors and sites unless an evaluation of the project shows that location outside of a designated area is the only practicable alternative.	New communication facilities would be located in designated communication sites or corridors unless an evaluation of the project shows that location outside of a designated area are the only practicable alternative.			

Mineral Resources

The minerals program consists of three categories: Saleable, Leasable, and Locatable. Saleable minerals (also referred to as mineral materials) include sand, gravel, and common varieties of stone and clay. These materials are sold to the public, on request, at fair market value or are provided to federal, state, and local government agencies through free-use permits. Leasable minerals include, but are not limited to, oil, gas, coal, sodium, potassium, and geothermal resources. Locatable minerals are those minerals that are appropriated by the public under the General Mining Law of 1872, as amended. Locatable minerals include, but are not limited to, metals such as gold, silver, zinc, manganese, copper, and uncommon varieties of stone.

Subject to valid existing rights existing at the time of designation, all WAs are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and from disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral leasing and all amendments thereto. The WAs cover a total of 120,599 acres.

Saleable Minerals

The reasonable foreseeable development (RFD) scenario for saleable minerals would be 40 new mineral material sites distributed throughout the planning area over the life of the plan, disturbing a maximum of 1,000 acres. At least one of these sites would be a community pit. The disturbed areas would be reclaimed when they were no longer needed or the permit expires.

Leasable Minerals

Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources

The RFD for oil, gas, and geothermal resources for the life of the plan will be a maximum of 10 holes drilled. BLM does not anticipate that any of these wells would be capable of production. The 10 holes would be dispersed throughout the planning area, with each drill hole disturbing an area of 5 to 7 acres, including the access road. The pads and associated access roads will subsequently be reclaimed.

Coal

There are no known coal resources within the planning area. It is not expected that a coal lease will be issued or a coal mine developed.

Other Solid Leasable Minerals

The RFD for other solid leasable minerals for the life of the plan would be a maximum of three exploration permits issued, resulting in a maximum of six exploration holes drilled, with minerals found but not in sufficient a quantity or quality to anticipate development. Each exploratory

drilling would disturb 5 to 7 acres, including any access roads. Maximum area of disturbance would be 42 acres for roads and pads, which would be reclaimed.

Locatable Minerals

The RFD for locatable minerals would be three to five new exploration level notices submitted per year for 20 years that would disturb a maximum of 5 acres per notice. There would be 5 to 10 new small locatable mineral operations developed over the life of the plan, which would disturb approximately 20 acres at each operation. There may be one large mine that may disturb 200 to 300 acres. The total estimated disturbance related to new mining exploration and operations over the life of the plan is 1,000 acres.

Table 2-15. Saleable Mineral Resources—Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP as amended and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>Establish community gravel pits where appropriate (all sales would be made from these pits).</p>	Community pits would not be authorized.	Community pits would be authorized on a case-by case basis.		
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP as amended and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>Sand and gravel permits will not be authorized on the 15 cultural resource sites and areas. (See also the “Cultural Resource Management” section of this chapter.)</p>	No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in the Swansea Townsite, and cultural sites and areas and site complexes managed for conservation for future use, traditional use, and public use and Special Cultural Resource Management Areas.	Mineral material development would be authorized on cultural sites and areas and site complexes managed for conservation for future use, traditional use, and public use and Special Cultural Resource Management Areas.	No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in the Swansea Townsite, and cultural sites and areas and site complexes managed for conservation for future use, traditional use, and public use and Special Cultural Resource Management Areas.	No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in the Swansea Townsite, cultural sites and areas, and site complexes managed for conservation for future use, traditional use, and public use.
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP as amended and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>No sand and gravel permits or new utility rights-of-way will be authorized on the four areas managed under special prescriptions (Whipple Mountains, Aubrey Hills, Gibraltar Mountains (now wilderness), and Cactus Plain).</p>	No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in the Lake Havasu SMRA and the Cactus Plain WSA.	<p>Mineral material development would be authorized in the Lake Havasu SMRA.</p> <p>No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in the Cactus Plain WSA.</p>	No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in the Lake Havasu SMRA and the Cactus Plain WSA.	No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in the Aubrey Hills Recreation Management Zone (RMZ) and the Cactus Plain WSA.
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP as amended and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p>	No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in	Mineral material development would be authorized in riparian	No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in riparian areas.	

Table 2-15. Saleable Mineral Resources—Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p>In the Bill Williams Riparian Management Area, no additional mineral material removal permits will be authorized.</p> <p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1995 KRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the KRMP:</i></p> <p>Do not allow mineral material disposals in riparian zones (Three Rivers Riparian ACEC).</p>	<p>riparian areas.</p>	<p>areas.</p>		
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP as amended and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>No sand and gravel permits will be authorized on priority wildlife habitat areas.</p>	<p>No new sites or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in bighorn sheep lambing grounds and desert tortoise Category I habitat.</p>	<p>All mineral material activities will be confined to the dates of July 1 to December 31 for areas defined as bighorn sheep lambing grounds and reclamation will require the use of a native seed mix.</p> <p>Mineral material development would be authorized in desert tortoise Category I habitat.</p>	<p>No new sites or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in bighorn sheep lambing grounds and desert tortoise Category I habitat.</p>	<p>No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in desert tortoise Category I habitat.</p> <p>All mineral material activities will be confined to the dates of July 1 to December 31 for areas defined as bighorn sheep lambing grounds and reclamation will require the use of a native seed mix.</p>
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1983 LGNMFP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the LGNMFP:</i></p> <p>Allow development of sites for saleable minerals where they do not conflict with WSAs and proposed ACEC designation.</p> <p><i>The following decision is derived from the</i></p>	<p>No new sites or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in ACECs.</p>	<p>Mineral material development would be authorized in ACECs.</p>	<p>No new sites or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in ACECs.</p>	<p>No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in the Bullhead Bajada ACEC and the Beale Slough ACEC.</p>

Table 2-15. Saleable Mineral Resources—Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<i>1987 YRMP as amended and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i>				
No additional sand and gravel permits are authorized in the designated special management area (Crossman Peak Natural Scenic Area).				
<i>The following decision is derived from the 1993 Parker Strip Recreation Area Management Plan:</i>	No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in Open OHV Areas or RMZs managed for extensive OHV use.	Mineral material development would be authorized all Open OHV Areas, except for Copper Basin Dunes.	No new or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized in Open OHV Areas or RMZs managed for extensive OHV use.	
Sand removal from the Copper Basin Dunes west of Parker Dam Road will no longer be permitted. The area is part of the off-highway vehicle area.				
Not address under previous plans	No new sites or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized on lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics.	Mineral material development would be authorized on lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics.	No new sites or expansion of existing mineral material disposal sites would be authorized on lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics.	Mineral material development would be authorized on lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics when there would be no lasting impacts to solitude, unconfined recreation, and naturalness.
The total area open to mineral material disposal is 894,890 acres and 447,611 acres are restricted from mineral development as shown in Map 2-15	The total area open to mineral material disposal is 799,680 acres and 542,821 acres are restricted from mineral development as shown in Map 2-16.	The total area open to mineral material disposal is 1,101,564 acres, 240,931 acres restricted from mineral development and 60,658 acres are restricted as shown in Map 2-17.	The total area open to mineral material disposal is 895,079 acres and 447,422 acres are restricted from mineral development as shown in Map 2-18.	The total area open to mineral material disposal is 996,974 acres, 299,802 acres restricted from mineral development and 45,725 acres have a time restriction as shown in Map 2-19.

Table 2-16. Leasable Mineral Resources–Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1987 YRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>Surface occupancy for oil and gas leases will be authorized on the Crossman Peak Natural Scenic Area.</p> <p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1983 LGNMFP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the LGNMFP:</i></p> <p>Restrict any actions or withdrawal in the planning area that would “segregate” leasable minerals unless there is strong evidence that the area is not conducive to mineralization.</p> <p>Leave the planning area open to mineral leasing.</p> <p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1985 LGSRMP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the LGSRMP:</i></p> <p>Leasable minerals will be managed under the leasing regulations.</p>	The entire planning area, outside of WAs, would be open to mineral leasing			
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>Surface occupancy for oil and gas leases will be allowed on all priority wildlife habitat areas except on bighorn sheep lambing grounds and lands immediately adjacent to springs in priority wildlife habitat (approximately 40 surrounding acres</p>	All exploration and major construction work for mineral leases would be confined to the period between July 1 and December 31 for areas defined as bighorn sheep lambing grounds and reclamation would require the use of a native seed mix.			

Table 2-16. Leasable Mineral Resources–Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
at each spring).				
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>Surface occupancy for oil and gas leases will be permitted on all of the four areas managed under special prescriptions (Whipple Mountains, Aubrey Hills, Gibraltar Mountains, and Cactus Plain).</p>	Surface occupancy for mineral leases would not be permitted on the Cactus Plain WSA.			
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>Surface occupancy for oil and gas leases will not be authorized on the 15 cultural resource sites and areas. (See also the “Cultural Resource Management” section of this chapter.)</p>	Surface occupancy for mineral leases would not be authorized on the cultural resource sites and site complexes managed for conservation for future use, traditional use, and public use.			
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>Surface occupancy would be prohibited on future oil and gas leases on riparian lands along the Bill Williams River and on all other riparian areas covered by the former Yuma RMP.</p> <p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1995 KRMP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the KRMP:</i></p> <p>Mineral leasing would be allowed with a No Surface Occupancy stipulation in the Three</p>	Surface occupancy for mineral leases would be prohibited within 0.25 mile of the Bill Williams and Colorado Rivers and within the riparian zone of the Three Rivers ACEC.			

Table 2-16. Leasable Mineral Resources–Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Rivers Riparian ACEC.				
Lands allocated to conserve wilderness characteristics were not addressed in previous plans.	Surface occupancy would be prohibited on lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics.	Surface occupancy for mineral leases would be permitted on lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics when there would be no lasting impacts to solitude, unconfined recreation, and naturalness.	Surface occupancy would be prohibited on lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics.	Surface occupancy for mineral leases would be permitted on lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics when there would be no lasting impacts to solitude, unconfined recreation, and naturalness.
24,112 acres are restricted with a no surface occupancy stipulation as shown in Map 2-20.	262,481 acres are restricted with a no surface occupancy stipulation; and 45,919 acres have a time restriction as shown in Map 2-21.	69,123 acres are restricted with a no surface occupancy stipulation; and 60,321 acres have a time restriction as shown in Map 2-22.	113,910 acres are restricted with a no surface occupancy stipulation; and 56,131 acres have a time restriction as shown in Map 2-23.	69,123 acres are restricted with a no surface occupancy stipulation; and 60,321 acres have a time restriction as shown in Map 2-22.

Table 2-17. Locatable Mineral Resources—Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1987 YRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>Improvements on the 15 cultural resource sites and areas are restricted to those that are compatible with the cultural resources or those required for mining. Approximately 6,000 acres (88%) of the 15 cultural sites and areas are under BOR withdrawal and therefore segregated from mineral entry and development. Mining activity on the remaining cultural sites and areas will be managed so as to avoid disruption or, where this is not possible, to minimize damage to cultural values using regulatory standards contained in 43 CFR 3800. (See also the “Cultural Resource Management” section of this chapter.)</p>	Approximately 200 acres of the Swansea Townsite would be recommended for withdrawal.			
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1995 KRMP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the KRMP:</i></p> <p>Withdraw approximately 486 acres from mineral entry in the Three Rivers Riparian ACEC subject to a mineral report and valid existing rights.</p>	The riparian area of the Three Rivers Riparian ACEC would be recommended for withdrawal, which covers 238 acres.	This decision is not carried forward.	The riparian area of the Three Rivers Riparian ACEC would be recommended for withdrawal, which covers 238 acres.	

Table 2-17. Locatable Mineral Resources—Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1995 KRMP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the KRMP:</i></p> <p>Withdraw 1,280 acres from mineral entry located within T. 20 N., R. 21 W., Sections 34 and 35 to protect cultural and biological resources.</p>	<p>Recommend for withdrawal approximately 185 acres within the Bullhead Bajada ACEC.</p>	<p>This decision is not carried forward.</p>	<p>Recommend for withdrawal approximately 185 acres within the Bullhead Bajada ACEC.</p>	
<p>This site was not addressed in previous plans</p>	<p>Recommend for withdrawal approximately 10 acres to protect the Incline Railway in the Harcuvar Mountains.</p>	<p>Incline Railway in the Harcuvar Mountains would not be recommended for withdrawal</p>	<p>Recommend for withdrawal approximately 10 acres to protect the Incline Railway in the Harcuvar Mountains.</p>	
<p>See Map 2-24 for areas limited to mineral development and those recommended for withdrawal.</p>	<p>See Map 2-25 for areas recommended for withdrawal.</p>			<p>See Map 2-25 for areas recommended for withdrawal.</p>

The following decisions from previous LUPs would not be carried forward, except in Alternative One (No Action);

The following decisions are derived from the 1995 KRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the KRMP:

Mineral material disposal would be authorized only when no reasonable management alternative can be identified and the disposal would not conflict with objectives for the area.

The following decision is derived from the 1985 LGSMP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the LGSMP:

Demand for saleable minerals will be met by sales or free-use permits on a case-by-case basis.

The following decisions are derived from the 1983 LGNMF and are applicable only to those lands covered by the LGNMF:

Leave the planning area open to mineral location and development.

Protect bighorn sheep lambing areas and a 2-mile buffer zone (28,000 acres) in the Little Harquahala Mountains and the Harquahala Mountains from habitat and behavioral disturbances created by mining activity between December 15 and April 15 (within the framework of the 43 CFR 3809 regulations)

The following decisions are derived from the 1985 LGSRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the LGSRMP:

Exploration and development in the RMP/EIS area will continue to be administered in accordance with existing surface and mineral management regulations (43 CFR 3809 and CFR 3802)

Paleontological Resource Management

Paleontological resources found on public lands are recognized by BLM as constituting a fragile and nonrenewable scientific record of the history of life on earth, and therefore represent an important component of America's natural heritage. BLM would actively work with other agencies, professional organizations, educational institutions, and interested members of the public to enhance the preservation and protection of scientifically important fossils and trace fossils. To help assure their preservation, specific locations of paleontological sites will not be provided in this RMP/EIS.

Table 2-18. Paleontological Resource Management–Desired Future Conditions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Paleontological resources would be managed for their scientific, educational, and recreational values, and adverse impacts to these resources would be mitigated. BLM would preserve and protect significant vertebrate paleontological resources for present and future generations. Scientifically significant invertebrates (to be determined by a qualified paleontologist) would also be protected.			

Table 2-19. Paleontological Resource Management–Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	<p>The Golden Shores mammoth site and the Chemehuevi Formation localities would be managed for their scientific values.</p> <hr/> <p>Areas would be classified according to their potential to contain vertebrate fossils or noteworthy occurrences of invertebrate or plant fossils. These classifications are shown in Table 2-20 below.</p>			
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	<p>Fossil localities would be identified and managed in accordance with their scientific, educational and recreational values through the life of the plan. All vertebrate fossils and noteworthy invertebrate and plant fossils would be managed for their scientific values. Common invertebrate and plant fossils would be available for recreational collecting.</p>	<p>Recreational collecting areas for common invertebrate and plant fossils would be identified. Interpretive signs would be installed where they would contribute to public education.</p>		<p>Fossil localities would be identified and managed in accordance with their scientific, educational and recreational values through the life of the plan. All vertebrate fossils and noteworthy invertebrate and plant fossils would be managed for their scientific values. Common invertebrate and plant fossils would be available for recreational collecting.</p>

Table 2-20. Paleontological Resource Classifications

Classification	Definition
Class 1 (Low sensitivity)	Igneous and metamorphic geologic units and sedimentary geologic units where vertebrate fossils or uncommon non-vertebrate fossils are unlikely to occur.
Class 2 (Moderate sensitivity)	Sedimentary geologic units that are known to contain or have unknown potential to contain fossils that vary in significance, abundance, and predictable occurrence.
Class 3 (Moderate sensitivity)	Areas where geologic units are known to contain fossils but have little or no risk of human-caused adverse impacts and/or low risk of natural degradation.
Class 4 (High sensitivity)	Areas where geologic units regularly and predictably contain vertebrate fossils and/or uncommon non-vertebrate fossils, and are at risk of natural degradation and/or human-caused adverse impacts.

Administrative Actions

- When evaluating proposed actions on public lands, apply the following goals and objectives:
 - Identify areas and geological units (e.g., formations, members) containing paleontological resources.
 - Evaluate the potential of these areas to contain vertebrate fossils or noteworthy invertebrate or plant fossils.
 - Develop management recommendations (including mitigation measures in specific locations) to promote the scientific, educational, and recreational uses of fossils on public lands.
- Develop a monitoring program on public lands where important paleontological localities have been identified.
- BLM will identify and protect significant fossil resources and allow for scientific research at paleontological sites, in accordance with the applicable permitting procedures.
- BLM will include paleontological resources in its cultural resources public education programs. These programs will provide information directly related to procedures to be followed if fossilized items are found, and will specify fines for removing fossilized items from BLM-administered lands.
- Newly identified vertebrate localities would be evaluated to assess their importance and the potential threat of loss. These findings would be used to determine an adequate monitoring program.

- A records search for paleontological resources would be conducted on all major land use actions as appropriate. Surveys prior to, or monitoring during, ground-disturbing land uses would be conducted as necessary to protect significant paleontological values.
- BLM would survey for paleontological resources in Class 4 areas as funding becomes available.
- The Golden Shores mammoth site would be monitored annually. Other localities with scientifically important fossils would be monitored annually or as needed to address potential threats.

Management Common to All Alternatives

- Preserve and protect scientifically significant paleontological resources for scientific, educational, and recreational uses.
- Ensure that all land use authorizations consider and are consistent with objectives for proactive use of scientifically significant paleontological resources.

Recreation Management

BLM recognizes that recreation and tourism are significant economic drivers in most cities, towns, and communities affected by the issues and concerns of public land management. A clear majority of the public's interactions with BLM are through various forms of outdoor recreation and sports. BLM's *Priorities for Recreation and Visitor Services* (2003) states, "Our multiple-use mission is to serve the diverse outdoor recreation demands of visitors while helping maintain the sustainable conditions needed to conserve their lands and their recreation choices." The wide range of recreational pursuits available in the LHFO area includes camping in dispersed or primitive sites, developed campgrounds, and cooperatively managed concession resorts; boating, fishing, and any number of other water sports on the Colorado River and Lake Havasu; and, in the upland desert locations, hiking, hunting, shooting sports, rock-hounding, photography, birding, exploring the back roads and trails by OHVs, bikes, and horses, and OHV desert racing. For many, the vast open spaces that our public land provides represent the "Old West," and have been described as the "remnants of the American Frontier." As such every acre of land has some recreational value and can provide for a recreation opportunity in conjunction with any other resource demand.

Primarily, public lands are managed to maintain a freedom of recreational choice with a minimum of regulatory constraints. Where the nature of the resource attracts concentrated or intensive recreational use, public lands may be managed as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). These are areas where BLM focuses specific management, funding and planning to provide for the best possible recreation experience while protecting, sustaining, and enhancing the environmental resources of these areas.

Specific management direction in an SRMA is devised to provide public enjoyment, resource protection, and public health and safety. Within SRMAs, Recreation Management Zones (RMZs) may be identified to provide site-specific planning and management. Although tentatively identified in this document the RMZs are subject to adjustment in implementation-level planning to account for the environmental and visitor use flux that occurs. In addition new or adjusted management/administered actions may be developed in specific SRMA activity plans. BLM also manages recreation in the area outside of SRMAs; this area is known as the Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA). There are no RMZs in ERMAs because these are by definition areas that do not receive focused, specific recreation program management.

The proposed Extensive and Special RMAs are not intended to confer authority, responsibility, or jurisdiction over lands and waters that are not currently under the jurisdiction of BLM, but for planning purposes the value and quality of these adjacent lands is vital in developing strategies to manage these areas effectively

The following alternatives address BLM's local, regional, and national goals (see Appendix H) for providing a wide range of opportunities for environmentally responsible recreation. Management actions common to LHFO planning area and MUs are applicable within SRMAs and the ERMA unless otherwise stated or adjusted in individual activity plans.

Table 2-21 Recreation Management—Desired Future Conditions

Extensive Recreational Management Area (ERMA)		
Manage this extensive area to ensure quality experience and enjoyment of natural and cultural resources on BLM and BLM partnered lands. Provide for enhanced recreation experiences and enjoyment while protecting resources, ensuring public safety and resolving user conflicts.		
Colorado River Nature Center SRMA		
<i>Primary Market Strategy for SRMA – Community</i>		
<i>SRMA Market – Residence of the Bullhead urban development and surrounding rural area</i>		
RMZ 1 – Southern Bluff	<i>Niche:</i>	Manage to provide needed natural open space within close proximity to population center
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in personal discovery.
RMZ 2 – River Side	<i>Niche:</i>	Enjoyment of Colorado River scenery and appreciation of wildlife viewing opportunities
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in rest and relaxation in close proximity to the scenic Colorado River and gain knowledge of surrounding wildlife through varying interpretive elements
Lake Havasu SRMA		
<i>Primary Market Strategy for SRMA – Destination</i>		
<i>SRMA Market – Residents of and visitors to the Lake Havasu Region</i>		
<i>SRMA Desired Future Condition- Manage Recreation on the Lake and Shoreline to sustain natural resource values and recreational opportunities</i>		
RMZ 1 – Whipple Mountains	<i>Niche:</i>	Wilderness trekking in rugged scenic natural settings
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in a remote isolated recreation experience.
RMZ 2 – North Aubrey	<i>Niche:</i>	Hiking & Equestrienne activities in close proximity to population center
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors and residence to engage the targeted activities in a short time frame (i.e. after work or during a single day)

Table 2-21 Recreation Management—Desired Future Conditions

RMZ 3 – Aubrey Hills	<i>Niche:</i>	Hiking & Equestrienne activities for scenic and wildlife appreciation
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in the targeted activities, including primitive backpacking and tent camping.
RMZ 4 – AZ Shoreline	<i>Niche:</i>	Fishing and Boat-in only campsites for personal enjoyment, scenic, wildlife and social appreciation.
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage to provide opportunities for visitors to engage fishing, camping and day use activities and realize the targeted benefits.
RMZ 5 – Havas Springs	<i>Niche:</i>	Boat launch, boating activities and shoreline fishing facilities for personal enjoyment
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage to provide visitors with access to variety of water sports and recreational fishing opportunities
RMZ 6 – CA Shoreline	<i>Niche:</i>	Primitive camping, fishing and day use opportunities in a scenic natural setting
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage to provide opportunities for visitors to engage wilderness adventure and those targeted activities in a moderately isolated setting
RMZ 7 – North Lake Havas	<i>Niche:</i>	Boating for pleasure in close proximity to the service provided by Lake Havasu City
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors and residence to engage in a variety of water related activities, providing continuity to management though collaborative partnerships with other entities.
RMZ 8 – South Lake Havas	<i>Niche:</i>	Boating for pleasure in a natural scenic rural area,
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in a variety of water related activities, providing continuity to management though collaborative partnerships with other entities
Parker Strip SRMA		
<i>Primary Market Strategy – Destination</i>		
<i>Market – Visitors from to the Lower Colorado River</i>		
RMZ 1 – Parker Strip Urban	<i>Niche:</i>	Camping, seasonal residences and recreation opportunities along the banks of the Lower Colorado River
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage to provide visitors with access to a wide variety of recreation opportunities through concessions and BLM Managed facilities

Table 2-21 Recreation Management—Desired Future Conditions

RMZ 2 – Crossroads & Copper-basin	<i>Niche:</i>	Off High Way vehicle recreation in ‘open’ areas for personal exploration and challenge
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage to provide opportunities for visitors to engage those targeted activities and realize personal benefit
RMZ 3 – Parker Strip Backcountry	<i>Niche:</i>	OHV and trekking opportunities in a semi-isolated environment for scenic appreciation
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage remote, isolated recreation experiences
Swansea SRMA		
<i>Primary Market Strategy – Destination/Undeveloped</i>		
<i>Market – Residence of and visitors to the Western Arizona</i>		
RMZ 1 – Swansea	<i>Niche:</i>	Cultural discovery and personal exploration of historic mining
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in personal and interpretation guided discovery of the historical significance of the area
Gibraltar SRMA		
<i>Primary Market Strategy – Undeveloped</i>		
<i>Market – Residence of and visitors to La Paz Country</i>		
RMZ 1 – Gibraltar Wilderness	<i>Niche:</i>	Wilderness trekking in a natural scenic environment
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in wilderness adventure and experience solitude for personal challenge and reflection
RMZ 2 – Cienega	<i>Niche:</i>	Motorized access to backcountry trails in natural scenic environment with plentiful opportunities for cultural and wildlife appreciation
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage those target activities and receive a moderated realization of targeted benefits
RMZ 3 – Shea Rd	<i>Niche:</i>	Dispersed camping and viewing opportunities for competitive OHV racing
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage those targeted activities and realize benefits to persons, community and environment

Table 2-21 Recreation Management—Desired Future Conditions

RMZ 4 – Buckskin Mesa	<i>Niche:</i>	Trekking and OHV trail exploration for self-directed, primitive-mode challenge and recreation adventure
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage personal exploration and discovery through the outlined activities
RMZ 5 – Osborne Wash	<i>Niche:</i>	OHV use and dispersed camping opportunities as a staging area for a wider trail network
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide visitors with access to a wider network of trails and collaborate with the management of lands adjacent to the area to realize the highest benefit to the local community and area visitors
Havasu Urban SRMA		
<i>Primary Market Strategy – Community</i>		
<i>Market – Residence of Lake Havasu City and surrounding communities</i>		
RMZ 1 – Standard Wash	<i>Niche:</i>	OHV riding for challenge and pleasure in close proximity to urban area
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors and residence to access OHV enjoyment in a short time frame (i.e. after work or during a single day)
RMZ 2 – Crossman Peak	<i>Niche:</i>	Scenic hiking and equestrian opportunities and limited OHV trail riding for personal exploration and discovery
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide visitors and residence with a scenic backdrop to Lake Havasu City and associated Lake Havasu SRMA and provided access to those targeted activities
RMZ 3 – Havasu Urban Interface	<i>Niche:</i>	Access to public lands with opportunities for hiking, equestrian, OHV, wildlife & Cultural appreciation and other recreational activities
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors and residence quick access to engage in those targeted activities and realize benefits to persons, community and environment
Plomosa SRMA		
<i>Primary Market Strategy – Undeveloped</i>		
<i>Market – Visitors to and residences of the local communities in the area</i>		
RMZ 1 – Backcountry Byway	<i>Niche:</i>	Driving for pleasure along a scenic byway connecting two communities
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage those targeted activities and again knowledge and appreciation of the byway theme through its interpretation

Table 2-21 Recreation Management—Desired Future Conditions

RMZ 2 – Plomosa Mountains	<i>Niche:</i>	Trekking and seasonal OHV use for wildlife appreciation and personal challenge
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage challenging personal discovery in a isolated setting experience elements of solitude
RMZ 3 – Bouse Plain	<i>Niche:</i>	Disappeared camping and OHV riding opportunities for pleasure
	<i>Management Objective:</i>	Manage this Zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in those targeted activities and realize benefits to persons, community and environment

Table 2-22. Summary of Recreation Opportunity Settings (ROS) Alternatives

Recreational Management Area	RMZ - Name	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
ERMA					
		See Map of existing ROS Inventory (Map 3-6)			
Colorado River Nature Center	River Side	Rural Natural	Suburban	Rural Developed	
	Southern Bluff	Rural Natural	Suburban	Rural Developed	Rural Natural
Lake Havasu SRMA	Whipple Mountains	Semi- Primitive			
	North Aubrey	Rural Natural			Rural Developed
	Aubrey Hills	Rural Natural			
	AZ Shoreline	Rural Developed			Rural Natural
	Havasus Springs	Rural Developed		Suburban	
	CA Shoreline	Rural Natural	Semi-Primitive		
	North Lake Havasu	Rural Natural	Rural Developed		
	South Lake Havasu	Rural Natural			
Parker Strip SRMA	Park Strip Urban	Suburban			
	Crossroads and Copper Basin	Rural Developed	Suburban		Rural Developed
	Parker Strip Backcountry	Semi-Primitive	Rural Natural	Semi-Primitive	
Gibraltar SRMA	Gibraltar Wilderness	Primitive			
	Cienega	Rural Natural	Suburban	Rural Developed	
	Shea Rd	Semi-Primitive	Rural Developed	Rural Natural	
	Buckskin Mesa	Semi-Primitive	Rural Natural	Semi-Primitive	
	Osborne Wash	Rural Natural	Rural Developed		

Table 2-22. Summary of Recreation Opportunity Settings (ROS) Alternatives

Recreational Management Area	RMZ - Name	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Havasu Urban SRMA	Standard Wash	Rural Developed	Suburban	Rural Developed	
	Crossman Peak	Rural Natural	Rural Developed	Rural Natural	Semi-Primitive
	Havasu Urban Interface	Rural Natural	Suburban	Rural Developed	
Plomosa SRMA	Backcountry Byway	Rural Natural	Rural Developed		
	Plomosa Mountains	Semi-Primitive	Rural Natural		Semi-Primitive
	Bouse Plain	Rural Natural	Rural Developed	Rural Natural	
Swansea SRMA	No Zones Allocated	NA	Rural Developed	NA	Rural Natural

Table 2-23. Recreation Management–Land Use Allocation

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<i>The following two decisions are derived from the 1995 KRMP and are applicable to lands covered by that plan:</i> Designate six SRMAs and prepare management plans for them per BLM policy. Designate that portion of the resource area not lying within SRMAs as the Kingman Extensive Recreation Management Area.	All public lands in the LHFO planning area would be managed as either Extensive or Special Recreational Management Areas. Within this area SRMAs are identified as those areas having a distinct primary recreation-tourism market and requiring additional activity planning to manage appropriately. The remaining public lands comprise ERMA. In addition SRMAs or contain RMZs that allow site-specific management within the greater units (see Map 2-26)			
1,334,532 acres would be allocated as the ERMA the remaining acres would be allocated between 1 SRMA as detailed below.	1,053,592 acres would be allocated as the ERMA the remaining acres would be allocated between 6 SRMAs as detailed below.	1,049,715 acres would be allocated as the ERMA the remaining acres would be allocated between 7 SRMAs as detailed below.	1,053,592 acres would be allocated as the ERMA the remaining acres would be allocated between 6 SRMAs as detailed below.	1,049,715 acres would be allocated as the ERMA the remaining acres would be allocated between 7 SRMAs as detailed below.
Colorado River Nature Center SRMA				
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	The Colorado River Nature Center SRMA is 363 acres, an area that includes the previous facilities developed in partnership with other agencies. The SRMA is divided into two RMZs (See Map 2-26): RMZ 1 - Southern Bluff – 100 acres RMZ 2 - River Side – 263 acres			
Lake Havasu SRMA				
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	The Lake Havasu SRMA (57,581 acres) would include an area from the south edge of the Havasu Wildlife Refuge to the Parker Dam including both AZ and CA shorelines. The area would also include the Lake Havasu Aubrey Hills region west of State Route (SR) 95 and the Whipple Mountains west of the CA shoreline (see Maps 2-26 and 2-27). The SRMA would consist of 8 RMZs that would have management prescribed to them to achieve the goals, setting, and experiences desired for recreational resources in each.			

Table 2-23. Recreation Management–Land Use Allocation

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
	RMZ 1 – Whipple Mountains – 9,496 acres			
	RMZ 2 – North Aubrey – 4,923 acres			
	RMZ 3 – Aubrey Hills – 11,517 acres			
	RMZ 4 – AZ Shoreline – 1,745 acres			
	RMZ 5 – Havasu Springs – 1,380 acres			
	RMZ 6 – CA Shoreline – 1,589 acres			
	RMZ 7 – North Lake Havasu – 20,726 acres			
	RMZ 8 – South Lake Havasu – 6,205 acres			
Parker Strip SRMA				
<i>The following decision is derived from the 1973 Yuma District Management Framework Plan and is applicable only to the lands covered by that plan:</i>	The Parker Strip SRMA would continue to manage the area outlined in the <i>Parker Strip Recreation Area Management Plan</i> (1993). This consists of approximately 25,449 acres of land. Three RMZs would be identified within the SRMA.			
Designated as “Parker Strip Recreation Lands” or “Colorado River Recreation Lands” in accordance with 43 CFR Part 2070 (Class II – General outdoor recreation area).	RMZ 1 – Parker Strip Urban – 10,185 acres			
	RMZ 2 – Crossroads & Copper-basin – 2,782 acres			
	RMZ 3 – Parker Strip Backcountry – 12,482 acres			
Swansea SRMA				
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Area not managed for Recreation. See “Special Area Designations” and “Cultural Resources.”	The Swansea SRMA (3,837 acres) would encompass the historical town site and outlining areas (see Map 2-26). This SRMA comprises one RMZ consisting of the total acreage of the	Area not managed for Recreation. See “Special Area Designations” and “Cultural Resources.”	The Swansea SRMA (3,837 acres) would encompass the historical town site and outlining areas (see Map 2-26). This SRMA comprises one RMZ consisting of the total acreage of the

Table 2-23. Recreation Management–Land Use Allocation

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
		SRMA.		SRMA.
Gibraltar SRMA				
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	The Gibraltar SRMA (49,167 acres) would include from the Bill Williams wildlife refuge to Osborne Wash, Shea Road, and west to the tribal lands and Parkers urban interface. Within this area five RMZs are initially identified. (See Maps 2-26 and 2-28)			
	RMZ 1 – Gibraltar Wilderness – 18,726 acres			
	RMZ 2 – Cienega – 9,140 acres			
	RMZ 3 – Shea Rd – 5,798 acres			
	RMZ 4 – Buckskin Mesa – 15,118 acres			
	RMZ 5 – Osborne Wash – 385 acres			
Havasupai Urban SRMA				
<i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and is applicable only to the lands covered by that plan:</i>	The Havasupai Urban SRMA (64, 753 acres) is identified as the area immediately east of Lake Havasu City and to the north and south of the city limits. It extends back up towards Crossman peak. With in this SRMA three RMZs are initially allocated (see Maps 2-26 and 2-29)			
Designated special management area -- Crossman Peak as a Natural Scenic Area (26,080 acres)	RMZ 1 – Standard Wash – 6,291 acres			
	RMZ 2 – Crossman Peak – 25,594 acres			
	RMZ 3 – Havasupai Urban Interface – 32,868 acres			
Plomosa SRMA				
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	The Plomosa SRMA (112,116 acres) contains the public lands between Bouse and Brenda (see Maps 2-26 and 2-30). Initially three SRZ have been identified.			
	RMZ 1 – Backcountry Byway – 6,001 acres			
	RMZ 2 – Plomosa Mountains – 28,484 acres			
	RMZ 3 – Bouse Plain – 77,631 acres			

Table 2-24. Recreation Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and is applicable only to the lands covered by that plan:</i></p> <p>Where adverse impacts to natural values would result from recreation development, such development will either not be allowed or will be mitigated in a manner that protects the full integrity of the natural values</p>	Where long-term impacts from recreational use patterns are observed or anticipated, control activities through specialized management actions such as designated campsites, permits, and limitations on number of users, types of use and duration of use. Recreation management plans would be reviewed when they become ineffective			
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and is applicable only to the lands covered by that plan:</i></p> <p>No new development of any kind will be allowed in the floodplain of desert washes</p>	No new development of any kind would be allowed in the floodplain of desert washes except for public health and safety or resource protection.			
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	No new concession leases would be permitted on LHFO-managed lands.	New concession leases would be allowed in accordance with the desired ROS settings of the area.		
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	A variety of portable interpretive media (maps, brochures, guidebooks, etc.) would be developed to interpret the cultural, wildlife, and biological resources of this area.	Interpretive, information, and orientation signs would be provided at scenic views, wildlife watching areas, and other key locations. Safety and resource protection would be emphasized.	Custodial management within the ERMA would include the development and construction of orientation and informational kiosks at scenic views, trail heads and wildlife viewing areas to interpret the cultural, wildlife, and recreational value of the area.	

Table 2-24. Recreation Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and is applicable only to the lands covered by that plan:</i></p> <p>The length of stay for camping is limited to 14 days within any 28-day period except in concessions, public agency leases, and Long-Term Visitor Areas (LTVAs).</p>	<p>Throughout the lands managed by LHFO, unless otherwise posted or restricted, dispersed camping (in undeveloped areas) would be allowed without permit for no longer than 14 days within any 28-day period. After the 14th day, campers must move beyond a 25-mile radius of their previous camp. Would not apply to concessions, public agency leases, and Long-Term Visitor Areas (LTVAs).</p>			
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Dispersed camping would be prohibited within 2 miles of the municipal limits of any incorporated town or city that has established camping regulations.	Dispersed camping would be allowed within the municipal limits of any incorporated town or city that does not have established camping regulations.	BLM would coordinate with incorporated towns and cities to create suitable management of dispersed camping on public lands within the vicinities of these locations.	
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and is applicable only to the lands covered by that plan:</i></p> <p>No permits or fee would be necessary for recreation-related collection of dead and detached firewood in the vicinity (100 yards) of campsites for campfires. (See “Biological Resource Management.”)</p>	Collection of firewood for dispersed camping would be prohibited within the planning area. (See “Biological Resource Management” in this chapter.)	Collection of dead and down firewood within the vicinity (300 feet) of a dispersed campsite would be authorized for campsite use only, unless otherwise posted. (See “Biological Resource Management” in this chapter.)	Collection of dead and down wood within the LHFO would be prohibited except for wood collected within the vicinity (100 feet) of a dispersed campsite for campsite use only. Firewood collection for campsites may be closed within specific areas identified in activity plans. Education would be used to promote use of commercial firewood and camping stoves on public lands. (See “Biological Resource Management” in this chapter.)	
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Paintball activities would not be allowed in WAs and ACECs. Such activities would be allowed elsewhere	Paintball activities would be allowed beyond 1 mile of any established facilities or sites, campgrounds, residences, trailheads,	Paintball activities would not be allowed in WAs and ACECs. Such activities would be allowed elsewhere in the planning area, if suitable to other resource management objectives and special management allocations. In addition Paintball activities would be restricted in accordance with	

Table 2-24. Recreation Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
	in the planning area, if suitable to other resource management objectives and special management allocations. In addition Paintball activities would be restricted in accordance with local and State laws governing recreational shooting (i.e. prohibited within ¼ mile of structures etc). Further stipulations would apply and are outlined in Appendix H.	staging areas, roads, Special Area Designations, and other areas as posted. These activities would be further restricted to areas where the remnants and debris of the paintball and firearm ammunition is of least visibility.	local and State laws governing recreational shooting (i.e. prohibited within ¼ mile of structures etc). Further stipulations would apply and are outlined in Appendix H.	
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Target shooting and paintball activities would be prohibited on public lands, except for R&PP and commercial leases specifically designed to manage these activities.	Target shooting would be allowed beyond 1 mile of any established facilities or sites, campgrounds, residences, trailheads, staging areas, roads, Special Area Designations, and other areas as posted.	Recreational shooting would be governed by the local and state laws applicable across the field office boundaries. The activities may be further restricted where public safety and significant resource concerns exist. Shooting sports would continue to be allowed in R&PPs and other leases specifically designed to manage these activities.	
<i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and is applicable only to the lands covered by that plan:</i>	The Parker 400 course would continue as a competitive, commercial-use off-road race course. The season of use would continue to run from December 1 through February 28. The specific course alignment will be determined through a NEPA process.			
One competitive-use OHV event route is designated in the district, the Parker 400. The	The Parker 400 course would be limited to two competitive-use events per year (See Map 2-31)			

Table 2-24. Recreation Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
season of use is from December 1 through February 28.				
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and is applicable only to the lands covered by that plan:</i></p> <p>Additional competitive-use of OHV areas would be designated in the appropriate activity plans to meet the increasing public need for such areas. Events not scheduled for the Parker 400 course must comply with District OHV designations and Special Recreation Permit (SRP) provisions.</p>	No additional competitive-use off-road race courses would be allowed.	<p>Additional competitive-use off-road race course would be authorized in the appropriate activity plans to meet the increasing public need if the outlined criteria (see Appendix H) are met.</p> <p>The NEPA process would determine number of events and season of use on any proposed new competitive and/or commercial courses.</p>	No additional competitive-use off-road race courses would be allowed, except in designated open areas (See Transportation and Public Access).	
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Specialized Vehicle Recreation activities would only be permitted in existing OHV open areas (see Map 2-32.	Specialized vehicle recreation (see Glossary for definition) activities would be allowed in open areas and on designated routes/trails for this purpose.		
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and is applicable only to the lands covered by that plan:</i></p> <p>Additional LTVAs would be established on the basis of a demonstrated need and compatibility with ongoing land and resource</p>	BLM would not establish any LTVAs.	BLM would establish an LTVA(s) and/or new camping areas based on criteria outlined in Appendix H.	BLM may consider establishing an LTVA(s) and/or new camping; maximum size/acreage would be determined by LTVA	The establishment of new camping areas including LTVAs would be based on criteria outlined in Appendix H.

Table 2-24. Recreation Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
uses. <i>The following two decisions are derived from the 1995 KRMP and are applicable to those lands covered by that plan:</i> Do not designate any areas as LTVAs.			suitability/compatibility with adjacent lands. This establishment would be based on criteria outlined in see Appendix H.	
Lake Havasu SRMA				
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	BLM would provide minimal visitor services; however Law Enforcement officers would enforce resource protection and visitor safety laws, rules and regulations	Development of visitor-oriented facilities would include and would not be limited to, interpretive installations, parking and boat ramps, contact stations and both hiking and water trails.		
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	No vending would be permitted within the SRMA, excluding vending authorized in conjunction with an SRP.	Vending would be allowed within the SRMA. The issuance of permits would be consistent with the criteria outlined (see Appendix H).	Vending would be limited within the SRMA to certain RMZs. The issuance of permits would be consistent with the criteria outlined (see Appendix H).	
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Overnight camping would be limited to the developed recreation sites on the AZ/CA shoreline (RMZs 4 and 6). Undeveloped shoreline would stay open to day use, unless posted otherwise.	Overnight camping and day use would be allowed on undeveloped sites within the AZ/CA shoreline (RMZs 4 and 6), unless posted otherwise.	Along the AZ/CA shoreline (RMZs 4 and 6) overnight camping would be limited to recreation sites allocated to that use, including undeveloped areas signed to that effect.	

Table 2-24. Recreation Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	No new camp/day use sites would be developed.	New overnight camping and day use sites would be developed in conjunction with environmental mitigation and assessment. Any facilities developed on the California side (RMZ 6) would provide for a more primitive and isolated experience.	New overnight camping and day use sites would be developed in conjunction with environmental mitigation and assessment consistent with the MSCP. Any facilities established on the California side (RMZ 6) would provide for a more primitive and isolated experience.	
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	LHFO would continue to charge a day use/camping fees for BLM-developed sites within the area. The fee would be appropriate to the economics of maintaining the area and provide for fair value in recreation.			
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	No trail would be developed in the Lake Havasu Aubrey Hills/Sara Park area (RMZs 2 and 3).	A scenic hiking trail would be developed along the Arizona shoreline and within the Lake Havasu Aubrey Hills area (RMZs 2, 3, and 4). Coordination and partnerships with other landowners, agencies, and user groups would be undertaken to achieve this development.	A scenic non-motorized trail would be developed in RMZs 2, 3, and 4. Coordination and partnerships with other landowners, agencies, and user groups would be undertaken to achieve this development.	
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Within the SRMA, BLM would not permit	Within the SRMA BLM would require special recreational permits (SRPs) for organized events and activities that impact the public lands comprising		

Table 2-24. Recreation Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
	recreational activities that impact the public lands comprising the lake bottom.	the lake bottom and shoreline.		
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Minimal shoreline development of public fishing opportunities at Black Rock Cove would be undertaken.	LHFO would continue to cooperate with the Lake Havasu Fisheries Program partners to develop additional, free public shoreline fishing facilities within the SRMA.	LHFO would continue to cooperate with the Lake Havasu Fisheries Program partners to develop one additional, free public shoreline fishing facility on the Arizona side of Lake Havasu at Black Rock Cove, Contact Point, or Partners Point (see Map 2-32) (RMZ 4).	LHFO and the Lake Havasu Fisheries Program partners and other interests would develop no more than three additional free public shoreline fishing facilities on the Arizona side of Lake Havasu at either Black Rock Cove, Contact Point, or Partners Point (see Map 2-32) (RMZ 4).
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Important aquatic habitat would be identified to boaters with marker buoys, and protected as required to achieve the desired habitat condition.	Informational buoys would be installed for public information or education in areas with habitat degradation.	Educational and informational buoys would be installed to alert the public to important fish and wildlife habitat areas.	
Parker Strip SRMA				

Table 2-24. Recreation Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1993 Recreation Area Management Plan and is applicable only to the lands covered by that plan:</i></p> <p>Within 0.5 mile of Parker Dam Road, camping is limited to designated campsites.</p>	Camping would be limited to concession resorts and designated campgrounds.	In the Parker Strip SRMA, within 0.5 mile of Parker Dam Road, camping would be limited to designated campsites or concession resorts.	Camping in the Parker Strip SRMA would be limited to concession resorts and designated campgrounds, or to at least 0.5 mile from all maintained paved roads, unless otherwise posted.	
Swansea SRMA				
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Area not managed for Recreation (see “Special Area Designations” and “Cultural Resources”)	Camping would be allowed within the SRMA only in the identified campsites for a maximum stay of 3 nights.	Area not managed for Recreation (see “Special Area Designations” and “Cultural Resources”)	Camping would be allowed within the SRMA only in the identified campsites for a maximum stay of 3 nights.
		Interpretive trails will be constructed to protect resources and provided for visitor enjoyment and safety.		Interpretive trails will be constructed to protect resources and provided for visitor enjoyment and safety.
Gibraltar SRMA				
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	No development would take place within RMZ 2.	Within the SRMA BLM except for RMZ 1, BLM would consider developing campsites and facilities to protect important natural and cultural resources and to provide for growing recreation demand.	Develop primitive camps and group campsite within the Cienega RMZ (RMZ 2).	Within the SRMA BLM except for RMZ 1, BLM would consider developing campsites and facilities to protect important natural and cultural resources and to provide for growing recreation demand.

Table 2-24. Recreation Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Low-impact trails may be developed and interpretive materials provided at trailheads.			
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	The Osborne Wash area (RMZ 5) would be designated “limited” for OHV use in conjunction with the Transportation Management Plan (TMP).	Within Osborne Wash area (RMZ 5) LHFO would develop OHV staging areas, facilities for enhanced use of the area and educational Kiosks. Sensitive wildlife habitat, cultural resources, and public safety issues would be identified and mitigated for in this area.		
Havasu Urban SRMA				
<i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP (1992 Amendment) and is applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i> The Standard Wash OHV Area (approximately 11,558 acres) is designated in the Havasu Resource Area.	Standard Wash (RMZ 1) would be designated as “limited” in accordance with the route designation process to achieve recreation management goals. Restrictions would be developed alongside the TMP (see “Transportation and Public Access”).	Within Standard Wash (RMZ 1) LHFO would develop OHV staging areas, facilities for enhanced use of the area and educational Kiosks. Sensitive wildlife habitat, cultural resources, and public safety issues would be identified and mitigated for in this area.		
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Standard Wash (RMZ 1) would be closed to recreational shooting activities (except legal hunting).	Standard Wash (RMZ1) would be open to recreational Shooting.	Standard Wash (RMZ 1) would be closed to recreational shooting activities (except legal hunting).	
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	The area known as Craggy Wash (within RMZ 3) would be closed to camping.	The Craggy Wash area would be established as an LTVA guided by the criteria set out for	The Craggy Wash area would be maintained as a 14-day camping area. Better delineate the	The Craggy Wash area would be maintained as a 14-day camping area. The camping

Table 2-24. Recreation Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
		this MU.	camping area and manage the subsequent OHV use that originates there.	area would be better identified. This approach would include enforcing a 1-mile no-camping limit from the city limits of Lake Havasu City.
<p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1987 YRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>Crossman Peak is designated a Natural Scenic Area (26,080 acres) (Map 2-59).</p> <p>Allowable uses in the Crossman Peak Natural Scenic Area include compatible activities or those uses whose impacts can be mitigated to preserve or enhance the recognized values.</p> <p>Improvements on designated special management areas would be restricted to those compatible with the natural or cultural resources for which the area is recognized and, on Crossman Peak, to those permitted by the mining laws</p>				
This area is addressed as RMZ 2 within the Havasu Urban SRMA (sees Table 2-23).				
Plomosa SRMA				

Table 2-24. Recreation Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Within RMZ 2 recreational activities would be limited to those sensitive to the biological resources of the area.	Recreation activities would be limited to pastimes that are sensitive to cultural and natural resources within RMZ 2. These limitations would include seasonal restrictions to OHV use. <hr/> BLM would encourage learning and appreciation of the natural world by developing interpretive kiosks throughout the SRMA		

Administrative Actions

- On-the-ground presence would be used to provide the delivery of visitor services, information, interpretation, and stewardship as a tool to protect public land resources.
- Coordination would be conducted with general public, federal and state agencies, county and local governments, and Tribes in recreation planning and travel management. Working partnerships would be developed and sustained to this end.
- “Tread Lightly, and Leave No Trace” travel and camping techniques would be encouraged throughout the lands managed by LHFO.
- Activity plans would be created or reviewed for all SRMAs designated in the RMP. All recreation management activities and developments in the SRMA would also be in support of the individual SRMA goals and objectives.
- All recreational shooting-related materials would be required to be removed upon completion of the activity. In addition, paintball ammunition must be classified biodegradable by the manufacturer.
- Organized, competitive, and/or commercial specialized vehicle recreation activities would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis as part of an SRP process.
- Development of recreation management strategy for interim management of the Lake Havasu SRMA is a high priority and would serve as the precursor to any coordinated lake management plan. Partnerships and collaboration with other jurisdictions on the lake including but not limited to the U.S. Coast Guard, County Sheriffs, state agencies, and others would be sought to improve recreation management of the lake surface.
- Shoreline development will be coordinated, reviewed, and approved through Bureau of Reclamation to ensure compatibility with Reclamation’s Parker Dam and Lake Havasu project’s uses.
- Information and orientation materials dealing with recreation, maps, safety, and resource concerns would be posted on kiosks located at all primary access points and at critical areas within the LHFO.
- BLM would work to coordinate the fee structure and collections with other agencies, primarily Arizona State Parks within the Lake Havasu SRMA.
- Implementation-level planning would make determinations as to where specific trails, trailheads, facilities and kiosks would be needed in conjunction with cultural and biological resource needs and mitigations.
- Temporary closures would be utilized in parts of the Swansea SRMA while cultural restoration work and maintenance is completed if necessary for the protection of the work site and/or resources.
- Update plans to provide for public education and interpretation of cultural resources within the Swansea SRMA.

- BLM in collaboration with partners would establish a strong visitor services presence within the Gibraltar SRMA. Example: Visitors would see park rangers, maintenance workers, and law enforcement officers on a regular basis. Visitor services would be provided in accordance with desired ROS settings.
- A task force of stakeholders would be established to create a coordinate approach to managing the Havasu Urban SRMA to maintain the Lake Havasu view shed and desired ROS class (see Appendix H).
- Uncontrolled recreational shooting within the Havasu Urban SRMA would be discouraged though increased patrols and ethics programs.
 - BLM would, when practical, implement agreements with other political entities or private sector operators for the shared installation or operation of new developed recreation facilities under conditions appropriate to its agency mission and consistent with public demand.
 - BLM would continue to maintain bulletin boards and kiosks containing maps and information on natural, cultural, historical, and local features and on public safety. Locations would be near main intersections, remote and popular recreation sites. Around developed communities BLM would increase signage and enforcement of pertinent laws and regulations to manage camping and other recreation use.
 - BLM would continue active participation in the Lake Havasu Fisheries Improvement Partnership, and would continue to support the five handicapped-accessible shoreline fishing facilities constructed on Lake Havasu. The five facilities are Mesquite Bay, Site Six, Bill Williams Refuge, Havasu Springs Resort, and Take-off Point.

Management Common to All Alternatives

- Recreational activities near population centers and highway corridors would be promoted by placement of appropriate visitor-use infrastructure. Restrooms and other facilities adequate for anticipated uses would be provided at designated campgrounds, trail heads, and other areas where there is a concentration of recreational users.
- ERMA areas would be managed in a custodial fashion; necessary maintenance, Management Actions, and mitigation would take place as needed.
 - Where there is a public demand and where the actions are environmentally sound and in appropriate settings, BLM would strive to develop facilities such as trailheads, parking, bulletin boards, trails, and restrooms.
 - Public lands would be open to rockhounding in reasonable amounts (as much as 25 pounds per day, 250 pounds per year, per person unless otherwise posted).

Transportation and Public Access

Public lands managed by BLM are intermingled with other federal agencies, county, state, and private lands. Managing access to and across public lands is a vital task for BLM. This authority includes but is not limited to:

- Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Sec. 102 (8), Sec. 312;
- Executive Order 11644; and
- Executive Order 11989.

The resources involved include OHV routes; county-maintained roads (under the administration of BLM), trails (hiking, equestrian, bike, and vehicular) and authorized or permitted users (ranchers, miners, and other agencies), where BLM has jurisdiction over or interest in the above resources.

The goal of the following alternatives is to provide a comprehensive management approach to improve public access and safety. BLM recognizes that the majority of use or travel in the planning area is recreational. However, the planning goal encompasses all forms of transportation on public lands.

As in previous plans, this RMP will implement the planning area into OHV area designations as defined in 43 CFR 8340.0-5(f), (g) and (h) and further specified in 43 CFR 8342.1. BLM's OHV area designations are listed below:

- *Open area* means an area where all types of vehicles use is permitted at all times; anywhere in the area is subject to the operating regulations and vehicle standards set forth in 43 CFR 8341 and 8342.
- *Limited area* means an area restricted at certain times, in certain areas, and/or to certain vehicular use. These restrictions may be of any type but can generally be accommodated within the following type of categories:
 - numbers of vehicles
 - types of vehicles
 - time or season of vehicle use
 - permitted or licensed use only
 - use on existing roads and trails
 - use on designated roads and trails
- *Closed area* means an area where any motorized use is prohibited. Use of motorized vehicles in closed areas may be allowed for certain reasons; however, such use will be made only with the approval of the authorized officer.

The route designation process will occur within 5 years of the date of acceptance of this plan. The result of the designation process will be implemented in a Travel Management Plan, resulting in a Travel Management Network (TMN) whereby all routes (including those previously designated) on the current inventory will be designated as open, closed,

or limited. The public will have the opportunity to participate in the route designation process. BLM would follow the process as listed in the management guidance section of this RMP, when creating the TMN, including evaluating routes using the criteria listed in the route evaluation tree in Appendix I.

Table 2-25. Transportation and Public Access–Desired Future Conditions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	<p>Designations would be made and management implemented for a balance of opportunities for the entire range of motorized and non-motorized access needs, while in balance with other resource values found on public lands.</p> <p>Reasonable, safe, and environmentally sound access would be provided to visitors, local residents, licensed or permitted activities, and property owners. LHFO would be linked with other state, regional, and land management agencies or interest groups to better facilitate travel management.</p> <p>Travel between communities within the planning area would be made safer.</p> <p>Public access easements would be acquired across private or state lands where public access to federal lands and waterways is not available.</p> <p>A public outreach program would be implemented for motorized and non-motorized users to instill and strengthen a more effective and responsible user ethic. Quality motorized/non-motorized visitor services information would be created and distributed, with interpretation and regulatory signage sufficient to meet user needs.</p> <p>BLM would continue to provide motorized and non-motorized access across public lands, with emphasis on development of non-motorized trails and trailheads.</p> <p>BLM would assess its responsibility to manage boat related transportation opportunities as they relate to BLM facilities on the Colorado river and Lake Havasu and to develop and implement management practices accordingly.</p>			

Table 2-26. OHV Area Designations

General Description of Classification	Estimated Acres of Public Lands by Alternative				
	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Open	2,602	2,602	6,754	6,754	6,754
Closed	126,032	126,032	121,009	121,009	121,009
Limited	—				
▪ Limited to authorized users only ¹	15,645	266,433	12,409	71,752	71,752
▪ Limited to existing roads and trails	947,578	745,166	938,053	923,059	923,059
▪ Limited to designated roads and trails ¹	220,327	156,501	223,467	157,591	157,591
▪ Limited to existing seasonal use	30,994	61,586	41,395	55,664	55,664
▪ Limited to designated seasonal use	5,059	12,304	5,046	12,304	12,304

¹. For Alternative 1: The number of acres has been updated through legislation, activity-level plans, and/or supplemental rules published in the Federal Register since publication of the YRMP, KRMP, LGNMFP, and LGSMP.

Table 2-27. Transportation and Public Access–Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1987 YRMP and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>The approved YRMP classifies 640 acres as open to intensive OHV use, 13,985 acres as limited to designated roads and trails, and 22,420 acres as closed to OHV use. OHV use is limited to existing roads and trails on the remaining 1,154,955 acres in the District. (“Existing” refers to those roads and trails that were present in the District on the date the plan was adopted.)</p> <p>Off-highway vehicle use on the (non-designated) areas managed under special prescriptions is limited to existing roads and trails.</p> <p>Roads accessing utilities in priority habitat would be designated as limited in, or closed to, public entry.</p> <p>(See Map 2-33.)</p>	<p>OHV area designations are shown in Table 2-27 and on Maps 2-33, 2-34, 2-35, and 2-36. Generally, the planning area would be classified as “limited to existing roads and trails” for motorized travel, unless specifically classified as in Table 2-25 or Map 2-36. Existing roads and trails for motorized use would be defined as those routes and trails found on route inventory completed in 1995 through 2004 and shown on LHFO inventory map (Map 2-37 and 2-38).</p> <p>Lambing grounds as identified in the “Biological Resources” section of this chapter would be classified as limited to seasonal use on existing trail/routes until the TMN plan is completed. See “Biological Resources” for seasonal closures for vehicles.</p> <p>Areas limited to existing roads and trails for motorized use would be classified as limited to designated roads and trails for motorized use in the TMP.</p> <p>Wheeled non-motorized carts would be allowed except in WAs.</p> <p>Motorized vehicles may be allowed to pull off a designated route 100 feet either side of centerline. This use shall be monitored on a continuing basis. If monitoring results show effects that exceed limits of acceptable change, motorized vehicles will not be allowed to pull off a designated route 100 feet either side of centerline in those areas where resource damage has exceeded limits of acceptable change.</p> <p>Technical Vehicle Specialized Sport Sites could be identified and managed as a Recreation Management Zone, (RMZ) or specific sites within RMZ or the ERMA and not part of the transportation network.</p> <p>Refer to the discussion in the “Special Area Designations” section of this chapter for additional motorized vehicle provisions in these areas (see Maps 2-61, 2-62, 2-63, and 2-64)</p> <p>Foot and equestrian cross-country travel would be allowed on public lands. California and Arizona state laws consider bicycles vehicles and Cross-country travel would not be allowed except in designated open areas. Except in WAs, all roads and trails would be opened to bicycles unless designated otherwise.</p>			

Table 2-27. Transportation and Public Access–Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
<p><i>The following decisions are derived from the 1987 YRMP as amended (1992) and are applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>Changes in off-highway vehicle designations will be addressed in the appropriate activity plans to avoid potential conflicts with other recreation uses, off-highway vehicle-related impacts on resources, or other management concerns.</p>	<p>Public lands within the Parker Strip Recreation Area, except in developed facilities and the two OHV areas, would be classified as limited to designated roads and trails. These designated trails and routes were established under the 1993 <i>Parker Strip Recreation Area Management Plan</i>. (See Map 2-26.)</p> <p>The 2,602 acres in the Crossroads and Copper Basin OHV areas would remain designated open to intensive OHV use. A recreation project plan was completed in 1996, and no changes in management are proposed.</p> <p>Standard Wash and Osborne Wash RMZs would be allocated "Open" depending upon the outcome of the Section 106 compliance process and the successful resolution of adverse effects to historic properties.</p> <p>Approximately 602 acres identified as resource protection sites would be designated Closed. See Map 2-36. (Note, sites smaller than 5 acres are not shown)</p>			
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	The Southern bluff RMZ above the Colorado River in the Colorado River Nature Center SRMA would be limited to authorized users for motorized vehicles.			
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	19,088 acres of public lands within the Lake Havasu Aubrey Hills (see Map 2-34) would be limited to authorized users.	10,748 acres of public lands within the Lake Havasu Aubrey Hills (see Map 2-35) would be limited to authorized agency service vehicles for authorized ROWs or for ownership access to private land, with the exception that one designated limited route would be open seasonally to all users to access Lake Havasu (see Map 2-62) in the "Special Area Designations" section	18,152 acres of public lands within the Lake Havasu Aubrey Hills (see Map 2-36) would be limited to authorized users.	Within Lake Havasu Aubrey Hills area, motorized use would be limited to authorized users. (See "Biological Resources.")

Table 2-27. Transportation and Public Access–Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
		of this chapter).		
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Vehicle use in areas allocated for maintaining wilderness characteristics would be limited to administrative/authorized use and that authorized by mining regulations (see “Mineral Resources”). The Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD)’s use of motorized and mechanized equipment off designated routes is considered an administrative use and will be allowed in suitable locations (as agreed to by BLM and AGFD).	No public lands will be allocated for maintaining wilderness characteristics.	To maintain the natural landscape in areas allocated for maintaining wilderness characteristics, vehicles would be limited to 17 miles of trails as shown in Map 2-53 until the TMN plan is completed. Final route designation for each area would be completed in that plan. Non-motorized access may include development of some trails or, to minimize disturbance of the ground surface, be limited to marking foot routes with posts.	To maintain the natural landscape in areas allocated for maintaining wilderness characteristics, vehicles would be limited to existing routes until the route designation process is complete.
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	<p>BLM would designate a TMN for the planning area within 5 years of adoption of this RMP through the TMP. The TMP would evaluate and designate all individual routes/trails for use within the planning area unless specified elsewhere in this RMP. BLM would follow the process as listed in the management guidance section of this RMP, when creating the TMN, including evaluating routes using the criteria listed in the Route Evaluation Tree in Appendix I. Map 2-37 identifies the six travel management areas that will be used in the development of the TMP.</p> <p>After the RMP and the TMP are completed, the factor determining a route’s status as open, limited, or closed would be if the route were shown on published BLM maps. Routes not on BLM</p>			

Table 2-27. Transportation and Public Access–Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
	<p>inventory data maps would be considered illegal and subject to closure and/or restoration.</p> <p>Permittees (e.g., for hunting, wood gathering, livestock operators) shall comply with field office route designations. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>BLM would not develop, endorse, or establish route or trail ratings. BLM may describe physical characteristics of a route.</p> <p>Proposals for new roads, routes, or trails, including but not limited to ROWs and/or administrative needs, would be evaluated and the route designated (see Appendix I) in conjunction with the NEPA process.</p> <p>Use of authorized ROWs would be managed for access and travel management.</p> <p>On published maps, areas designated as limited to authorized users would be shown as closed.</p>			
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	All rockcrawling vehicular activities would be prohibited in WHAs.	Rockcrawling vehicular activities would be allowed in WHAs.		All rockcrawling activities would be limited to locations away from special status species. This would be a consideration in the Route Evaluation Process.
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Impacts of motorized activity (except for authorized vehicles) would be evaluated and the areas could be closed or designated as limited to administrative access to motorized vehicles within ¼ mile of any spring. If necessary to maintain access, a new route may be established.			
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Specific routes or portions of specific routes through WHAs established for special status species may be closed to vehicular traffic.	Specific routes or portions of specific routes through WHAs established for special status species may be closed to vehicular traffic (except for administrative use) during the seasons when the habitats are being used and will be addressed during the route designation process.		
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	No new permanent	NA	No new permanent	No new permanent

Table 2-27. Transportation and Public Access–Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
	motorized routes would be authorized in areas allocated to wilderness characteristics, except those required by law and all existing routes would be close to motorized vehicles. (See the “Wilderness Characteristics” section of this chapter.)		motorized routes would be authorized in areas allocated to wilderness characteristics, except those required by law. (See the “Wilderness Characteristics” section of this chapter.)	motorized routes would be authorized in areas allocated to wilderness characteristics, except those required by law. (See the “Wilderness Characteristics” section of this chapter.)
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	Prior to completing the TMP, any vehicle tracks, ways or trails not represented on inventory maps would be subject to restoration actions as described in “Continuing Management Guidance,” earlier in this chapter. After site-specific cultural and wildlife clearances are accomplished, the restoration action could be completed without further NEPA or public notice.	No route restoration actions will take place until the completion of the TMP.	Prior to completing the TMP, any vehicle tracks, ways, or trails not represented on inventory maps would be subject to public notice and NEPA process before any restoration actions are taken.	Prior to completing the TMP and route designation process, any vehicle routes not represented on the route inventory maps would be subject to restoration actions as described in “Continuing Management Guidance,” in this chapter. After site-specific cultural and wildlife clearances are accomplished, the restoration action could be completed without further NEPA or public notice.

Table 2-27. Transportation and Public Access–Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Preferred)
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	BLM would minimize vehicle access to two river access points in the canyon below Alamo Dam.	BLM would allow vehicle access on open routes. BLM would work with landowners to provide public access to the river.	Through the route designation process, BLM would minimize vehicle access to two down river crossings from Alamo Dam. BLM would continue working with landowners to provide non-motorized access to the river.	
Approximately 5,023 acres identified as resource protection sites would be designated Closed. See Map 2-33. (Note, sites smaller than 5 acres will not be shown on map.)		These protection sites would not be carried forward into the new plan and the specific concerns addressed through the route evaluation and designation process.		
Not specifically addressed in previous plans	To protect and stabilize the sand dune complex and the associated vegetation within the Cactus Plain WSA, the area would be allocated as limited to authorized users of motorized vehicles (e.g., allotment permittees).	To protect and stabilize sand dune complex and the associated vegetation within the Cactus Plain WSA, the area would be allocated limited to designated trails. The two vehicle ways found in the area during the wilderness inventory conducted in 1982 would be designated by this RMP.	To protect and stabilize the sand dune complex and the associated vegetation within the Cactus Plain WSA, the area would be allocated as limited to authorized users of motorized vehicles (e.g., allotment permittees).	

Administrative Actions

- BLM would identify a Travel Management Network (TMN) through the development of an activity-level plan(s).
- Area designations (e.g., open, closed, and limited) set in the RMP will not be changed by the activity-level plan without an amendment to the RMP.
- Public scoping meetings would be held in local communities on the proposed TMN (route designations)
- BLM would evaluate the TMN as needed, and proposed new routes (motorized and non-motorized) would be considered during development of the TMP.
- BLM would continue to work with state or local agencies to provide necessary public access from their public roads to the secondary routes on public lands.
- BLM would help inform the public about requirements for access on or across private and state lands adjacent to LHFO lands. Any designated routes would not include non-BLM lands.
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)'s and AGFD's use of motorized and mechanized equipment off designated routes is considered an administrative use and will be allowed in suitable locations (as agreed to by BLM and AGFD) for such purposes as the following:
 - ❑ water supplementation;
 - ❑ collar retrieval;
 - ❑ capture and release of wildlife; and
 - ❑ maintenance, repair, and building or rebuilding of wildlife waters.

Management Common to All Alternatives

The goals of the TMP would be in concurrence with BLM's 2001 *National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands*. The plan(s) would:

- identify trails, ways, and routes in the LHFO planning area intended for motorized and non-motorized travel on public lands;
- improve legal access to public lands by identifying access needs across non-federal lands and recommend acquisition and funding strategies;

- provide reasonable access to private inholdings surrounded by public lands;
 - be consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act and develop greater access for the physically challenged;
 - set guidelines for managing roads and trails to protect resource values, promote public safety, and improve public compliance on designated routes;
 - develop monitoring procedures sufficient to detect and evaluate related impacts so that management changes can occur, if needed;
 - create an implementation schedule that must cover public education, mapping, signing of designated trails and routes, rehabilitation of closed routes, law enforcement, and maintenance;
 - incorporate the effective use of volunteers to provide “on the ground” information and route marking/signing for the public;
 - increase public involvement in the establishment, monitoring, and protection of routes/trails on public lands; and
 - set timelines for monitoring and plan review.
- Cross-country motorized use would be prohibited, except in designated open areas.